

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XIX. No. 26
WHOLE No. 520

APRIL 5, 1919

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
{ \$3.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

The War.—Unusual military activity was displayed on several fronts during the week. From March 24 to March 28 Lemberg was heavily shelled by the Ukrainians.

March 24, p.m.— In the Riga territory after a violent battle along the Mittau-Turkkum Railway, the Lettish forces

which for several weeks have been opposing a stubborn resistance to the Bolsheviks, defeated the latter and occupied the towns of Kemmern and Kalnzem. Kalnzem is about twenty miles southeast of Riga. The Lettish troops are now fighting for the Lettish Republic formed out of the old Russian province of Courland and extending from the Dvina westward to the Baltic, being bounded on the north by the Gulf of Riga and the Republic of Livonia, and on the south by the Republic of Lithuania which lays claim to 33,430 square miles of territory and a population of 6,000,000. These three republics together with the Republic of Estonia, which lies between Livonia and the Gulf of Finland have for several months opposed a sturdy resistance to the attacks of Bolshevik forces sent against them from Petrograd in the northeast, and Moscow in the southeast. It is urged by competent authorities that they should be helped in their struggle as they would form a series of buffer States against the red peril. The Lithuanian National Council in the United States in an authorized statement on March 29 asserted that the aim of Lithuania is to hold back Bolshevism in Russia until it is wiped out or becomes harmless. It added, however, that Lithuania unaided could not hold Bolshevism back indefinitely. A proposal was made to unify the command of the Lithuanian, Lettish and Estonian armies.

On the Archangel front in the Bolshoia Ozera sector and on the Vega front the Allied troops were heavily bombarded and attacked by large Bolshevik contingents. They repulsed every assault with heavy losses to the enemy. On the other hand on the Odessa front the situation for the Allies by March 29 according to a Paris dispatch was critical. A Russian Soviet communiqué of a few days before that date announced that Bolshevik forces were closing in upon the suburbs of Odessa.

According to dispatches to the London Exchange

Telegraph Company from Berlin and Copenhagen, the Allies have demanded the resignation of the Hungarian

The Hungarian Crisis Soviet Government, and the election of a national Hungarian assembly under the supervision of Allied troops.

This crisis was brought about by the sudden collapse of anything like a stable government in Hungary owing to the Bolshevik rule inaugurated last week, under which riot and anarchy almost everywhere prevailed. At Budapest serious disorders took place, shops were looted, personal property was confiscated, plate and furniture belonging to the wealthier classes were seized. A Vienna despatch transmitted by the Zurich correspondent of *L'Information*, says that Premier Lenine of the Russian Soviet Government sent to the Hungarian constitutional commission, a draft of a proposed constitution for Hungary. The Paris *Temps* of March 29 reported that military measures were taken to counteract the danger arising from the establishment of a Soviet Government at Budapest, and that in all probability the center of operations against the Hungarian Bolsheviks would be in Rumania with General Mangin in command of the Allied troops, while General Henrys would command the Polish contingent.

On March 29 President Wilson and the Premiers, constituting the Council of Four, delivered to Marshal Foch their instructions with regard to the situation at

The Polish Situation Danzig where the Germans refused to permit the landing of Polish troops.

The military situation at Danzig where negotiations were under way for the passage through Germany of three Polish legions, intended for service with the Polish army was unsettled and obscure. According to military experts attached to the Peace Commission, the German purpose seemed to be to direct the movement of these troops in such a manner as to avoid all chance of friction with the German population in the regions to be traversed. Therefore, as Danzig was named in the armistice as the port of debarkation best suited for the purpose, it was thought by the military authorities only proper that the Entente commanders should not regard any proposition by the German authorities, looking to the use of other German

ports, as a violation of the armistice. Up to March 30 nothing in the nature of an ultimatum was delivered and it was believed that the matter would be settled satisfactorily. One of the reasons of the delay was the failure to obtain the shipping necessary to convey the Polish legions to the German port of debarkation. According to a Copenhagen dispatch the text of the German reply to the Allies concerning the landing of Polish troops at Danzig showed that the Germans did not intend to give free access to the Polish army to West Prussia, for according to them, since the conclusion of the armistice, the situation in Posen, West Prussia and Danzig had entirely changed. Offering, therefore, the ports of Stettin, Koenigsberg, Memel or Libau, the German Government declared that all facilities for the speediest possible landing and transit of General Haller's Polish troops would be provided.

During the week efforts were made to embody in the text of the League Covenant some form of amendment which should specifically safeguard the Monroe Doctrine. *The League of Nations and the Monroe world.* It was understood that Pres-

Doctrine dent Wilson and his advisers, and, later on, the Council of Premiers, took into consideration certain suggestions made along the lines of an amendment offered by Mr. Taft, in which, if the Monroe Doctrine was not actually mentioned by name, it was clearly and evidently meant. It is now understood that the American Monroe Doctrine amendment to the covenant of the League of Nations was submitted to the Council of Four for final determination as to the course to be adopted concerning it. When the amendment came up at the last meeting of the League of Nations' Commission, an unexpected obstacle arose which caused it to be deferred. The objection then made was not against the Monroe Doctrine itself, but rather against the form of the amendment. The amendment was found to be so general that it seemed to include other similar doctrines: against this strong objections prevailed among other nations. Discussion failed to remove the objection, so the amendment was referred to President Wilson and the Premiers as the court of last resort. The Commission on a League of Nations will hold its final session in all probability on April 4.

It is understood that the committee charged with the selection of a permanent center for the League of Nations reached a definite decision in favor of Geneva. Rome, Brussels, the Hague and Constantinople were considered as possible headquarters. All for some reason or other were found unsuitable.

Alsace-Lorraine.—Recently there appeared in AMERICA the promise made by Marshall Joffre at the outset of the war to the people of Alsace-Lorraine. *Les Nouvelles Religieuses*, in its issue of March 1,

Religious Liberty 1919, gives the text of other promises made to the same people by other Frenchmen of high official position. M. Poincaré, Presi-

dent of the Republic, declared at Saint-Amarin, in Alsace, during the month of February, 1915, to a deputation of Alsatian mayors: "That he came to give the people of Alsace confirmation of the declarations already made to them by General Joffre."

France, happy to open her arms to Alsace, so long and so cruelly separated from her, has no doubt that victory will soon effect the deliverance of the provinces torn from her by force, she [France] will restore them to the hearth of their native land, and will respect their traditions and their liberties.

General Mangin in the month of November, 1918, in his proclamation declared: "The army of the Republic brings to the land of Lorraine liberty and justice. Your institutions, your traditions will be respected." During the same month General Gouraud said to the Alsatians: "France comes to you as a mother to her beloved child that has been lost but found. She will respect your customs, your local traditions, your religious beliefs, your economic interests; she will bind up your wounds and give you food."

A document that leaves no room for evasion was issued from General Headquarters on November 14, 1918.

The French Republic intends to resume in the lands which have been restored to her the tradition of liberalism which our fathers established in them. How can the peoples of Alsace and Lorraine doubt that their customs and local traditions, their religious beliefs and their economic interests must be respected, when they are aware of the manner in which France for four years has governed and administered the Alsatian cantons which it succeeded in reconquering and occupying in 1914.

These texts are a clear refutation of the statement made in the *L'Alsacien-Lorrain* of February 2, 1919, to the effect that General Joffre did not make the Alsatians a promise of religious liberty at Thann on November 24, 1914, which was published in AMERICA for March 15, 1919. His exact words, quoted from the *Bulletin des Armées de la République*, Mercredi 2 Decembre, p. 4, are as follows:

Notre retour est définitif; vous êtes Français pour toujours. La France vous apporte, avec les libertés qu'elle a toujours représentées, le respect de vos libertés à vous, des libertés alsaciennes, de vos traditions, de vos convictions, de vos moeurs. Je suis la France, vous êtes l'Alsace je vous apporte le baiser de la France.

In the light of these promises it is interesting to recall what precisely it is that the people of Alsace-Lorraine desire. Their wishes were formulated by Doctor Pfleger of Türkheim, member of the National Council of Alsace-Lorraine, before an assembly of the people of the provinces, held in one of the great halls of the "Sängerhaus" of Strasburg. The French journals have made much of this reunion of the new party in Alsace-Lorraine, which has succeeded to the Center Party formed before the war. The following passage, quoted from *Les Nouvelles Religieuses* for March 1, 1919, is a portion of his speech:

As far as our traditions, our customs and our convictions are concerned, we find in France a certain state of affairs, which, in vital points, is quite contradictory to our manner of life. We must look to it that during this period of transition [the time

of the armistice] no attempt is made by devious ways to introduce this new state of things. We ought, therefore, to declare immediately and with all frankness to Senator Debierre, of whom so much is being said lately, that he will not find supporters of his ordinance among us. [Loud applause.] The neutral French school does not accord with our wishes; on the contrary we wish to retain our confessional schools. [Loud applause.] As a consequence we do not wish religion to be banished from our school. [Loud applause.] On the contrary we wish the confessional school to be re-established in France. . . . As for separation between Church and State, we proclaim that we will not sacrifice our religious liberties, and that we will not accept a persecution of the Church. Authorized Protestants, for their part, have also insisted in the same sense as ourselves on the importance of this question.

The Masonic *Ligue de l'Enseignement* is already at work in the provinces, and an effort is being made to show that it is without danger to the Catholics. *La Croix* of February 23, 1919, makes a detailed study of the organization to prove that it is Masonic in origin, Masonic in spirit, and Masonic in operation; that it is a declared adversary and a formidable enemy of Catholic belief, and that the Alsatians who are letting themselves be associated with it are laboring under the delusions that have brought the Catholics of France to the state in which they are at present.

Ireland.—That sympathy for Ireland is growing in France is evidenced by the fact that two more of the liberal papers have begun to discuss the claims of Erin to freedom. *La Bataille*, official organ of the French trade-union movement, has called upon all French lovers of liberty to uphold Ireland's claims and *La Populaire*, a Majority Socialist paper, says:

Since August, 1914, the Governments of the Allies have repeated over and over again, almost to sickening point, that this war was being fought for right and liberty, for the deliverance of oppressed nationalities, and the restoration of their sovereignty and independence. Socialists understood quite well that the "rights of peoples to dispose of themselves" meant nothing more than a war phrase used by the chiefs of two coalitions so as to weaken their opponents. Ireland, which was promised the realization of her ideals under Gladstone, has now less liberty than ever.

Apropos of this same phase of the problem the Paris correspondent of the Manchester *Guardian* writes:

English people at home scarcely realize how strong the feeling is here in regard to England and her treatment of Ireland. French papers say little, but French people think a great deal. A friend of mine who has lived in Paris for twenty years and mixes freely among people of all opinions, tells me that on this point he finds no difference between extreme Nationalists and extreme Socialists. Mr. Lloyd George seems to think that he has disposed of the question when he points out that Ireland sent fewer soldiers to the war than England and Scotland. The argument is not very impressive to the Italians when they find England pressing for complete independence for populations that actually fought in the Austrian army. The only course consistent with England's dignity and her moral authority at the Conference is to support the application of the Sinn Feiners for a hearing before the Peace Conference.

Nor are the French and Italians the only Latins that are showing interest in Erin. Spaniards and Spanish-Americans are giving considerable attention to Sinn Fein and its leader, De Valera. A recent issue of *Revista Católica*, the most influential Spanish paper in the United States, contains a long and splendid article on the personality and achievements of the first President of the Irish Republic, while throughout South America, especially in Argentina, strong words are spoken in favor of recognition of Ireland's *de jure* freedom.

The people of the United States, irrespective of race and creed, still continue to show active interest in Ireland's cause. Three distinguished citizens, Messrs. Frank

Walsh, Edward Dunne and Michael American and Canadian Interests Ryan have been designated to proceed to Paris to demand recognition of the Irish Republic from the Peace Conference. Mr. Walsh, who was formerly chairman of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, has just retired from the National War Labor Board. Mr. Dunne has been judge of the Circuit Court of Chicago, Mayor of Chicago and Governor of Illinois, while Mr. Ryan was formerly City Solicitor of Philadelphia. Mr. Walsh thus announces the purpose of the mission:

The committee is going to France as American citizens holding no allegiance, material or spiritual, to any other nation on earth, but imbued with the necessity of extending the principles of free government to Ireland, which is the typical small nation of the world, being deprived of the right to determine for itself the form of government under which it shall exist. Naturally men and women of Irish blood and ancestry everywhere have a deep and sentimental attachment to the land which gave birth to their race, and at this crucial moment of new world concepts desire to render all the assistance in their power to the representatives of the people of Ireland delegated to attend the Peace Conference. The committee expects to remain in France until Ireland's case is fully determined by the Conference.

While such things are taking place in the States, Canada is not idle. The Irish and their friends in that country are active for Ireland in many ways, evidently to the surprise of many Canadians who have been disconcerted by the appearance of the flag of the Irish Republic, in processions, even in Montreal, as one paper has it.

Rome.—In his allocution of March 10, pronounced in the consistory on the occasion of the nomination of the Bishops to the sees left vacant during the war, the Holy

Father expressed his interest in the *Churches in The Orient* Oriental Churches, his solicitude for the temporal welfare of the peoples of the East, and his desire that the Peace Conference should not confer on the infidels a predominant influence in those unfortunate lands or permit the Holy Places, restored to Christianity after the lapse of so many centuries, to fall again into non-Christian hands.

The Supreme Pontiffs, said Pope Benedict XV, had from time immemorial shown a very deep affection for

the Church of that blessed region, which had been signalized by the work of the Redemption, and by the first preaching of Christianity, which had witnessed the first fruits of the apostolate and martyrdom, had been characterized by remarkable sanctity and Christian wisdom, and had given to the chair of Peter saintly Popes and to Christian society a Basil, an Athanasius, the two Gregories, and a Chrysostom. The Oriental rites had been carefully preserved by the authority of the Holy See, their Saints and Doctors given a place in the Roman calendar, and their writings preserved in the Roman liturgy. Pope Benedict referred briefly to his own efforts to assist the Uniate Churches in the Orient and to bring back to the bosom of the Church those who had been led into heresy and schism; and he spoke in particular of the constant endeavor he had made to give material aid to the unhappy Christians of the Balkans, of Russia and the Ottoman Empire, who had suffered so severely through the hazards of war, and most of all to the Armenians, and the inhabitants of Syria and Lebanon. In behalf of the latter he had been unceasing in his efforts, especially of those who had been condemned to death, the orphans, and the rest of the population who were exposed to cruelty and famine. To this end he had appealed more than once to the Sultan and to the rulers of other nations.

The Holy Father insisted on the convulsion in civic and religious life experienced in the countries of the Orient as a consequence of the political and social upheaval consequent on the strife of the nations, and the hope of religious liberty, and in general of better times foreshadowed by the coming of peace. He called attention to the sad spectacle of the dispersion of the missions, the loss of their churches and priests and to the common state of misery prevailing in the Orient. But his main solicitude was for the Holy Places:

What long and painful efforts have been made by Our Predecessors to liberate these places from the domination of the infidels! How much labor has been expended in their behalf and how much blood has been shed in the course of the centuries by the Christians of the West! And now that these Holy Places have been restored, to the immense joy of the good, to the hands of the Christians, We cannot but feel anxiety as to the fate reserved for them by the Peace Conference, because not only We ourselves but all Christians will assuredly be filled with grief, if the infidels are given a privileged place in Palestine, and still more, if these august monuments are put in the possession of peoples who are not Christians.

The Holy Father pointed out that non-Catholics, with every means at their disposal, are making profit of the accumulated miseries of the war to sow their doctrines, and that the Faithful in those lands are holding out their hands and begging the Holy See to assist them with food and clothing, and to have restored to them their missions, their schools, their churches. He himself had done all his slender means allowed, but he proposed to appeal to the Bishops of the entire world

to take this noble cause to heart and to respond to its needs with that charity which had been traditional with the Church in the case of the Orientals.

Russia.—There now seems to be little doubt that not only ex-Czar Nicholas, but his wife and five children were all put to death at Ekaterinburg last July by the Bolshevik Red Guards. Though the Mos-

The End of the ex-Czar and His Family cow Soviet admitted the killing of the Czar only, his entire family were murdered, too, according to the testimony of Count A. A. Tolstoy, who gathered the facts from friends and enemies that were near Nicholas during his captivity and execution. Tolstoy's account of the Romanoffs' last hours appeared some time ago in *Vremya*, a Russian paper published in Berlin, and the New York *Evening Post's* Stockholm correspondent has translated and summarized the article. The family's captivity is described as an "unbroken series of offenses and outrages of all conceivable kinds," the ex-Czar's wife and four daughters in particular being treated "with unheard-of roughness and brutality." When the mid-July advance of the Czechoslovak forces made it plain to the Ekaterinburg Bolsheviks that the city could not be held, the garrison demanded that the Czar and his family be put out of the way lest the imperial dynasty should be restored by the conquerors. On the People's Commissaries hesitating to take action, the Council of Workmen and Soldiers held a meeting at night, and a decree signed by two Bolshevik officials ordered a detachment of Red Guards to go to the prison and kill the ex-Czar and his family. Count Tolstoy thus describes what then took place:

The verbal communication of the sentence was received with loud hurrahs; whereupon, the whole mob rushed into the imperial family's bedroom. When the Czar and his wife heard the hurrahs and the noise made by the Red Guards they understood at once what was about to happen. They threw on their clothes and knelt down to pray. The young Grand Duchesses, in terror, pressed against one another. The heir began to cry and tried to rise, but he fell out of his chair; whereupon the Czar stopped praying and took him in his arms. At this moment the door opened, and Yurovsky, followed by the Red Guards, entered the room. . . . The Baroness Buxhoovden, who on hearing the noise, had hurried into the room, rushed forward to the Czarina, and then collapsed in hysteria. Yurovsky turned to the Czar and said, with a malicious grin: "I see that you have already prepared yourself." To this the Czar answered: "Yes, I am ready."

As the Red Guards feared that rifle bullets would ricochet from the brick walls of the small cellar, they shot their victims at close range with revolvers, aiming between the eyes or at the temples. The executioners related to their friends that the victim were shot one by one. First came the Czarina, then the Grand Duchesses, and finally the Czar, who all the time held the heir in his arms.

Count Tolstoy writes that after the execution the bodies were taken to an abandoned mine outside the town, soaked with kerosene and burned, the charred remains being covered with earth.

The Anglo-Irish Act of Union

ALFRED W. McCANN

AMERICANS of Irish extraction as a rule are unfamiliar with the "Act of Union," passed in 1800, which destroyed the Parliament of Ireland by fusing it with the Parliament of England. We are hearing much of the "Union" nowadays, and there is nothing remarkable in the phenomenon that reveals scores of well-meaning, rightly disposed, patriotic American citizens, profoundly impressed by the British argument that the Irish question is merely a domestic one, being to England what the negro question was to the United States.

Irishmen in Ireland, however, know how the Union was effected, following the defeat of the measure when first proposed in the House of Commons in 1799. They know how the Government dismissed from office everyone who voted against the Union in 1799; how it devoted its efforts to bribing members during the recess; how peerages, bishoprics, seats on the bench and commands in the army were freely given in exchange for votes for the Union. There are many aspects of the Union with which even the Irish in Ireland are unfamiliar, and a still larger number with which Americans of Irish extraction are unfamiliar. It is not surprising, therefore, that Americans who have no trace of Irish in them should be wholly unfamiliar with the Union sophistry.

Few are the Americans who know that in the destruction of the Irish Parliament, 1800, and in the Act of Union that followed it, twenty-two Irish peerages were created; that five peers received English peerages and twenty peers received higher titles; that eighty-four boroughs were disfranchised, treated as private property, compensation (bribes) being given for that "property" to their patrons. They do not know that each seat was valued at £7,500, and the whole sum awarded as compensation amounted to £1,260,000. They never heard that Lord Downshire received £52,000 as the owner of seven borough seats, or that £45,000 apiece went to Lords Shannon and Ely. They do not know that sixty-three members, who refused to vote for the destruction of their native Parliament as the bribed patrons of their seats demanded, vacated their seats, which were filled at once by Englishmen and Scotchmen, who immediately voted away a Parliament, in the continuation of which they had no interest and for the destruction of which they had accepted bribes.

The British are telling Americans now, and ex-President Taft is echoing the British argument, that the United States fought to preserve the Union of North and South, wherefore the United States cannot now advocate any separation of the Union of Ireland with England.

Americans know that the Union between the North and the South was a real Union, entered into by a sacred covenant of voluntary origin. The people of the South and the North were of the same blood. They shared

equally with each other in the laws and institutions of their own making. The bonds that united them had been wrought by generations of mutual endeavor. In that Union between North and South there was no consciousness of a separate nationality. All were on a parity with each other before the law; nowhere was there discrimination, special privilege or oppression. This was indeed a Union, and when the South attempted separation civil war resulted that the very foundations of our common liberty might not be undermined. Such a Union which the United States fought to maintain is in no sense similar to the Union now referred to by ex-President Taft and the British in America.

Besides the £1,260,000 given as "compensation" to the patrons of the boroughs disfranchised by the Act of Union, £3,000,000 extra were expended in actual payment to the persons who voted for the Union. Of the 300 members of the Irish House of Commons, 115 could not be reached by promises of promotion or reward. All of them voted against the Union, which was carried by a majority of whom only seven were unbribed.

Lord Byron, speaking in the House of Lords, April 21, 1812, said of this unholy marriage, which ex-President Taft now compares with the Union between North and South: "If it must be called a union, it is the union of the shark with his prey; the spoiler swallows up his victim and they become one and inseparable. Thus has Great Britain swallowed up the Parliament of Ireland, the Constitution of Ireland, the independence of Ireland." Seventy-four years later, April 16, 1886, Gladstone declared:

I have avoided that subject because I did not want to enter into the details of it. It is dreadful to read the language of Lord Cornwallis and the disgust of an honorable mind at the transactions in which he found himself under the painful necessity of engaging. I will only say that we obtained that Union between England and Ireland against the sense of every class of the community, by wholesale bribery and unblushing intimidation.

Americans can understand that where a real union exists a separation is impossible, but they can also understand that there can be no separation where there is no Union. The aspects of the Irish issue which even the Irish in Ireland do not fully appreciate are legion. Many of them, if not all of them, assume that the acts of bribery by which the Union was accomplished were specially devised instrumentalities, the operations of which were peculiarly anti-Irish. The facts are that bribery, corruption and blackmail were characteristic of the period and that England herself suffered losses through their operations, from which, to this day, she has never recovered. It would be remarkable indeed if self-respecting Englishmen persisted, as they do persist, in holding fast to the fruits of corruption, were their sentiments, convictions

and conduct not traceable to a past that even Gladstone hesitated to explore.

At the time of the seduction of the Irish Parliament, a Parliament in which Catholics were not allowed to sit, not only were royal persons dealing in army commissions, but they were also selling bishoprics and deaneries. The regulation price for securing army commissions by which young officers were promoted over the heads of veterans was fixed by the degree of superiority involved. An ensigncy was sold for £200, a lieutenancy for £400, a captaincy for £700. The rank of major commanded £900. Places were openly bought and sold, so vicious had become the corruptions of the times. Such public advertisements as the following from the *Morning Post*, June 14, 1800, were common:

PUBLIC OFFICES—A young man of good connections, well educated in writing and accounts, and can find security, wishes for a Clerkship in any of the public offices. Any lady or gentleman having interest to procure such a situation will be presented with the full value of the place. The greatest secrecy and honor will be observed.

So frequent were these advertisements that it became necessary to take official notice of them, as note the following from "The Dawn of the XIXth Century in England" by John Ashton (T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1906):

Custom House, London, December 7, 1902: Whereas advertisements have at different times appeared in the Newspapers offering Sums of Money for the procuring of places, the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs think it necessary to have it generally made known that, in addition to the punishment which the Common Law would inflict upon the offence of bribing or attempting to bribe any person entrusted with the disposal of any Office, the Statute passed in the fifth and sixth year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth inflicts the penalty of incapacity to hold such office in the person purchasing it and the forfeiture of office in the person selling it.

The government of England finally became so corrupt that January 27, 1809, G. Lloyd Wardell, M. P. for Oakhampton, began an indictment of the Duke of York before the House of Commons. He produced so much evidence of the sale of commissions by Mrs. Mary Anne Clarke, one of the mistresses of the Duke, that a Parliamentary Committee was appointed to investigate. So scandalous were the disclosures that his Royal Highness was forced to place his resignation as Commander-in-Chief in the King's hands. In this connection two facts are noteworthy in any study covering the merits of the Union issue. The British Government announced December 7, 1802, less than two years after the wholesale bribery of the Irish Parliament, that:

In case any place or office either shall have been, or shall hereafter be procured, or obtained by Corrupt means the Government are determined to enforce the penalties of the Law and to prosecute the offenders with the utmost severity. And they do hereby promise a reward of One Hundred Pounds to any person or persons who will give information and satisfactory proof of any place or office being so obtained, so that the parties concerned therein may be proceeded against accordingly.

This is fact No. 1. Fact No. 2 covers the "black list"

of those members of the Irish Parliament who received bribes for supporting the Union. This black list was in the hands of the British Government with all the evidence the Government needed, because it was the Government's own evidence, to punish the receivers of bribes as well as the officials who gave them. This black list, published 1833, by Sir Jonah Barrington, discloses the identity of the receivers of bribes who, having been "planted" in the Irish Parliament, sold that Parliament to England in the consummation of the Union which ex-President Taft compares with the Union between the North and the South.

No. 1 in the list is R. L. Alridge, an English clerk in the secretary's office, who had no connection, even remotely, with Ireland. No. 2, Henry Alexander, Chairman of Ways and Means, cousin of Lord Caledon. As a bribe his brother was made a bishop and he himself was appointed Colonial Secretary at the Cape of Good Hope. No. 3, Richard Archdall, was made Commissioner of the Board of Works. No. 4, William Baily, was made Commissioner of the Board of Works. No. 5, Right Hon. J. Bersford, was made First Commissioner of Revenue. He was brother-in-law to Lord Clare. No. 6, J. Bersford, Jr., was purse-bearer to Lord Clare, afterwards a parson, subsequently Lord Decies. No. 7, Marcus Bersford, Lord Clare's nephew, was a colonel in the army. No. 8, J. Bingham, was created a peer and received £8,000 for two seats, which amount was afterwards increased to £15,000 by the Government. After the bribe he was known as Lord Clanmorris. No. 9, Joseph H. Blake, was created a peer. He was later known as Lord Walscourt. No. 10, Sir J. C. Blackwood, was created a peer. He bore the title of Lord Dufferin. No. 11, Sir John Blaquire, was created a peer, with numerous offices and pensions. After the bribery he was called Lord de Blaquire.

No. 12, Anthony Botet, was appointed Commissioner of the Barrack Board. No. 13, Colonel Burton, brother to Lord Conyngham, received nothing as far as is known except his rank as colonel. No. 14, Sir Richard Butler, voted against the Union in 1799; after he received £15,000 he voted for it in 1800. No. 15, Lord Boyle, son of Lord Shannon, received with his father £30,000 for their seats and boroughs. No. 16, Rt. Hon. D. Brown, was brother to Lord Slago; it is not known what he received. No. 17, Stewart Bruce, gentleman usher at Dublin Castle, was made a baronet. No. 18, George Burdett, was made commissioner of a public board. No. 19, George Bunbury, was made commissioner of a public board. No. 20, Arthur Brown, voted against the Union in 1799. After the bribe, the amount of which is not recorded, he voted for the Union in 1800. No. 21, — Bagwell, Sr., received as a bribe half the patronage of Tipperary. His son was made a dean. No. 22, — Bagwell, Jr., received the other half of the patronage of Tipperary and got the Tipperary regiment. No. 128, was William Bagwell, his brother. It is not known what he received.

William Hancock, No. 60 on the list, composed and sang songs against the Union in 1799. After he was promised a peerage, which he subsequently got, he composed and sang "patriotic" songs for the Union in 1800. No. 81, Lord Loftus, son of Lord Ely, Postmaster General, bid high. He was created an English Marquis, receiving £30,000 for his own and his father's boroughs. No. 85, Francis McNamara, was cheap, being content with a private pension paid by Lord Castlereagh. No. 89, H. D. Massey, was cheaper still. He sold out for £400 cash. Professional politicians, Irish included, have been selling out ever since. Heaven be praised for those who with God's help resist temptation.

This will suffice. The entire black list, containing 140 names, with the amounts of the bribes and the honors attached to them, is too long to publish here. It is a matter of record to which all statesmen may refer.

The American people, knowing nothing of the corruption in which the Union was born, cannot understand the "hostile attitude" of the Irishman who knows all about it. To compare such a Union with the Union of the United States, and to cite the Civil War of 1861-1865 as a precedent in the maintenance of all Unions, is not only to strangle history but it irritates Irishmen in Ireland and the sons of Irishmen in America.

Loving the Union of the United States and hating the Union of England and Ireland, they are looked upon as "hyphenates," who refuse to forget the "more or less vague wrongs of the past" and foolishly assert the right of Ireland to secede from a Union that never had existence. If ex-President Taft would resort to the records, I, for one, have little doubt that he would become just as valiant a champion of Irish rights as he is now a champion of English wrongs.

Lebanon of the Cedars

J. C. WALSH

Staff Correspondent of AMERICA at the Peace Conference

THE members of the Peace Conference are in unanimous agreement on only one subject—the phenomenal capacity of the official translator, a French officer, who turns English into French and French into English in a way that amazes those who know only one of these languages, and delights the few who know both. There are times, however, when the translator is puzzled, as happened, for instance, when the Emir Faical addressed the Conference. He spoke in Arabic, and though none of the conferees understood him, yet all of them were tremendously impressed. Lloyd George, who was greatly taken with one passage, found on inquiry that it ran something like this: "Be pleased to remember, gentlemen, that I speak for a people which had a civilization when [he paused and looked his audience over] none of the nations I see here represented had an existence." I am not sure whether China was there or not, but the oratorical effect was perfect. A moment before the Emir had been claiming the people of Damascus and Aleppo for the kingdom of his father, the new ruler of the new kingdom of Hedjaz. "If you are not ready to take my word, send and ask. I am ready to abide by what they tell you down there."

Next day the American delegation got together a small committee to go down to Syria and ask the people there what they wanted. About the same time, Syrians friendly to France, encouraged by French statesmen to declare their preference, were meeting in conference and insisting that Damascus, Aleppo, and Caifa, a port, must go with the French Protectorate, not with Hedjaz. Again a few days, and a delegation from Lebanon arrived. It came just on time for the patronal celebration at the Maronite Church, Rue d'Ulm. Cardinal Amette honored the Maronites by his presence, and an eloquent preacher in

purple traced the history, part political, part religious, of the French Protectorate over Syria, which dates back to Louis XIV., and back of that to the Crusades.

The Mass was vastly interesting to a mere Westerner. The priest and the choir appeared to keep up a running conversation in the form of a chant which, musically, seemed to me rather primitive. The bell was ringing almost all the time. The priest was hardly ever without the crucifix in his hand, and used it to bless the congregation every few minutes. When Mass was over, the chalice remaining unveiled on the altar, the priest addressed the Cardinal, the Cardinal addressed the deputation, the procession left the sanctuary, and the chalice remained. The deputation and a host of friends followed into the sacristy, where everybody seemed to know everybody, and all seemed to be affectionate members of one big family. One saw at once that they were driven in upon one another by a sense of common resistance to some exterior hostility, or had been so driven and had preserved their habit. The following day I sought more information on the subject, and this is what I learned.

The Lebonites are a people about half a million strong, living upon the famous mountain of the cedars. In the main they are Catholics, but some are Orthodox Greeks, as people improperly call them, and some are Druses, a peculiar people, whose religion has little exterior manifestation but whose social system is very definitely organized. Politically they are all Lebonites. They have some historical relation to the old Phoenicians, and Tyre and Sidon are their outlets on the sea. Thanks to the vigorous action of France, instead of paying tribute to the Sultan they have long been in receipt of annual subventions as damages for past wrongs. They are very jealous of their autonomy, which they have always, some-

how, been able to preserve. They do not want to be swallowed up in any new arrangement in which their influence would be overweighted five to one by a Moslem population. They are apprehensive lest even France, their faithful friend, might in her own interest abridge their liberties and limit their national expression. They want to be free to expand onto the fertile plains which once were theirs and whence they were driven into the less hospitable hills. Their spokesman talked, I ventured to remark to him, very much as one hears Irish patriots talk.

"Oh, yes," he replied, "the eternal trinity of outraged nationality through all the centuries, what has it been? Ireland, Poland, Lebanon. We know how destructive may be the interest of others in our affairs. When there is discord in Europe, France pushes us, Russia pushes the Greek Orthodox, England pushes the Druses, and suddenly we Lebonites are at each other's throats. Then for long periods we agree again, until again Europe is astir, and again we quarrel. What we want now is to be given a status under which we can work out our problems as Lebonites. We can do it if they will let us alone. But will they? We are disturbed by this contention between France and England for lands adjoining ours. France claims that without Damascus, Aleppo, and Caifa the economic and political integrity of Syria is broken. England, laying the foundations of a structure whose outlines she envisages on terms of a century hence, is equally firm, equally insistent. If they are to clash, and the contest is to be chronic, how shall we fare? Shall we be able to hold together the three elements of our nationality, or will discord produced to suit the purposes of others be the normal condition of our existence? We are not vain enough to wish to dictate a new order for the world. We do want peace amongst ourselves. That is why this deputation has traveled so far."

Questioned as to the probabilities, my informant preferred not to venture an opinion. This much he would say: The English, according to his observation, are ceaselessly at work in such fields. Time does not count with them. They work, and await the favorable hour, whether that hour strikes this year, or in this generation, or a half-century hence. They have always men for such work. The French, on the other hand, talk well, and even act strenuously, in times of crises; but their loud "Pouf" of a day is followed by twenty years of silence.

When the Emir Faical appeared in Paris in his white turban, there was another white turban, and the face beneath it seemed hardly Arab at all. In fact, it was not. It belonged to one Lawrence, an Englishman, who had made this plan of preparing Arabia for a kingdom under British tutelage his lifework. When the war came, the work was already done. The Peace Conference will stamp it as officially completed. Wherever there is such a problem, the British have had their Lawrences at work, and such of them as are needed are now in Paris. The French organize friendly delegations and praise the reso-

lutions framed for the delegations to pass. The Americans send out parties of inquiry hastily organized in the last quarter of the twelfth hour. The work of the Peace Conference, much of which is a puzzle to the neophytes in world-politics who crowd its threshold, is fairly well typified by this small cross-section. It will help many to understand why a war fought to make the world safe for democracy is followed by a peace so many items of which seem to be designed to make the world safe for the expansion of England. There is no accident about it. The blocks fall into the picture as it was long ago designed they should so fall, by people who were thinking about such things when others were not, by people, moreover, who are masters of the political art of getting what they want by talking about something else. Clemenceau wonders where Balfour finds the time to play golf. Balfour does not worry. His work was all done for him years before Clemenceau—let us leave it at Clemenceau—found himself compelled to work at high pressure.

The Perils of Politics

MICHAEL WILLIAMS

BEFORE going to California for the first time, some twelve years ago, I had often heard the admiring tributes that were paid to the Golden State by progressives, liberals, radicals and all the varied types of social reformers, because California was so fecund and inventive and daring in the great matter of progressive legislation—and progressive legislation, of course, was the agency through which the reformers were certain they would make, if not a new heaven, at least a brand-new earth. Woman suffrage, the initiative, the recall, the referendum, direct election of Senators, were the great measures amongst a mass of minor, but all vastly important, political novelties, which California either adopted first, or was one of the first of the States to put into effect.

In those days I shared to the full the blind, unquestioning, fanatical faith which, in the period of strange fermentation just before the great war, so many of us placed in legislation as a cure-all of social evils. But I had not long dwelt in this paradise of the reformer ere I began to ask myself strange and unsettling questions. Unfortunately, also, for my naive peace of mind, I happened to be in active newspaper work, and was thrown a great deal among reformers, and among politicians, and among the mass of people; the common people, as the reformers delight to name them, who do the voting, and pay the taxes, and are affected by the laws made for them by the reformers, and put into operation by the politicians.

I remember with especial vividness one week during the nights of which it was my duty to sit from eight o'clock until ten or eleven listening to and reporting the evidence taken in the rooms of the Board of Election Commissioners, in an investigation of a recall petition.

A certain politician had been duly elected to the State legislature from a certain district. Another—a defeated politician, by the by—circulated a petition for the recall of the person elected, who was charged with grave dereliction of duty. The petition was signed by the requisite number of voters, men and women of all sorts and conditions, but all alike in the possession and employment of the potent suffrage. Noble citizens all. The women were *not*—as Mr. Brisbane would put “punch” in the word—slaves of the men, but their noble equals before the law. And the men were exercising the right only newly won to recall from office an unfaithful servant. Beautiful example of progressive legislation!

Unfortunately, some scores of fraudulent signatures happened to have obtruded themselves upon this great document, the recall petition. The case was taken to the proper authorities; there was a public hearing; the newspapers devoted space to the controversy, and night after night I heard the evidence given by perhaps seventy-five or one hundred witnesses, men and women, signers of the petition. There were doctors and lawyers and street-sweepers, and housewives, and business women. And the evidence usually went something like this:

“Your name is John Jones, or Mary Jones?” “It is.” “Is this your signature?” “Yes.” “Did you read the petition when you signed it? Did you know exactly what it was you signed?” “No.” “Why, then, did you sign it?” At this point the answers greatly varied. One would say, “Well, Joe Jenkins (one of the paid circulators of the petition) is a good fellow; he asked me to sign, so I did.” Another: “Why, I thought it was a petition for more street cars in our district; that’s what Bill Cummings told me, and I let it go at that.” Still another: “I was too busy to read the thing. If you stop to read all the petitions that come around nowadays, you’d have no time for work; so I just signed it, anyhow.”

In short, hardly two or three of all the witnesses possessed any knowledge of the wording of the petition; or considered it to have been their duty to read it before signing it; and if those who circulated the petition had not tried to make their work easier by slipping on a number of the names of dead persons and people who long ago had left the district, they could have put it through.

So much for that particular example of progressive legislation. And as it was in this case, so I discovered it to be in innumerable others. At election time in California there are so many scores of proposals on the ballot that not one average citizen in a thousand—indeed, I would dare to say, in ten thousand—ever stops to read them, still less to study them. This proposal or that one is defeated, or adopted, as the case may be, because this newspaper or that one, or some particular class of the population, conducts an agitation for it, or against it. But as for the electorate exercising its native wits, there is none of that, none at all.

And so today we see on the one hand a determined, energetic group, such as the Prohibitionists or the Woman

Suffragists, doing just what they will to do; and they are the types and examples of other groups who are weaving a web of legislation designed to fulfil their private desires; all these groups effecting their purpose by manipulating politicians, not by convincing the reason of citizens, or awakening their sentiments of patriotism or justice. And on the other hand we see a vast, worldwide and constantly growing distrust and loss of faith in all forms of representative government. This loss of faith in the panaceas of mechanistic democracy is at the bottom of Bolshevism. It is finding sinister expression in England, where the parliamentary system is tottering to its fall. It is voiced in its most attention-awakening fashion, perhaps, by President Wilson, warning the politicians gathered from all the ends of the earth at Paris that plain people everywhere themselves demand a hearing, and will not blindly yield their destinies to “their governments.”

But the politicians at Paris, in England, too, and in Germany, and in the United States, still play politics; still they trust to words and “acts” and “bills” and “treaties” and “covenants” and legislation of all kinds; and still they neglect the one thing without which all other things are of no avail: they will not listen to Jesus Christ. He came down upon earth to tell us that the end of life, the thing toward which all social action, all true politics, all art, science, government, personal and national ideals must tend, and must strive to attain, if they are to be worthy of human effort, is the salvation of the individual soul. He founded a Church, indefectible and infallible, by which and through which the end of mankind might be achieved. Today, in the midst of the world-ruin, even as in the days of Napoleon, of Bismarck, and of other super-politicians and world-heroes, you find here and there a statesman or politician who patronizingly condescends to religion: who looks upon it, perhaps, as a useful agency for keeping the people contented with their lot: but where are the statesmen who consider religion first, and who look upon politics as a sacred trust and duty, the temporal means for the attainment of as large a measure of human justice, and peace, and happiness, as is possible? Are there any such? There are many statesmen and politicians who can talk glibly enough, and indeed in many cases sincerely enough, about social justice and spiritual betterment, and uplift and enlightenment; but mostly what they really mean is the religion of the new paganism; of State-worship. And they form the most powerful peril in politics today, for unless the dissatisfaction with legislative methods which is ominously expressed in Bolshevism, the I. W. W.-ism, Syndicalism, Spartanism, and anarchy, shall succeed in overwhelming government of all kinds—save the self-imposed rule of the oligarchy which in all cases control these movements—there is reason to fear that the fever of legislative madness now at work will before long come to a crisis, and achieve permanency in State Socialism, which is the servile State. Only Christianity, only the Catholic Church, can save us from one or other disaster.

Suffragettes and Cloistered Nuns

HENRY E. O'KEEFFE, C.S.P.

HE was a strategist, this Ignatius Loyola, who, when he beheld authority being impugned, marshaled his forces toward the weak spot. His cohorts were to bleed for authority. At a command they must do. This Ignatian method could be reverently termed the exaggeration of the virtue of obedience to counteract the excesses of an historic vice, the denial of authority.

That light-hearted spiritual genius of Assisi, exploited a similar spirit, with his organized protest, against the glittering luxuries of the thirteenth century. The sordid indignities of poverty would offset the illicit opulence of the king, the courtier and sometimes the prelate. When the coarse habit of this sanctified reformer was frayed and tattered, his disciples constrained him to slough it off, if for no other than for hygienic motives. After a fervid disputation he consented, but in his sublime infatuation for the Lady Poverty, he took the patches from the old garment and sewed them on the new. It was the exaggeration of the virtue of holy poverty as a counter-irritant to the prodigality of that picturesque time.

Now, breathes there a man with manner so ungallant as to accentuate the contrast between the suffragette and the cloistered nun? Yet it were no rash deed to aver that if one is not a counter-irritant to the exaggeration of the other, one could be a saving complement of the other. The other could impair the defects of the one. The one could requite the insufficiencies of the other. The cloistered nun might become a sociological necessity to adjust the suffragette to a novel situation, with which, at present, she seems out of joint. If perchance, a philosopher should be so absurd as to fancy that the suffragette symbolizes a deordination, then the nun being her complement could co-ordinate all that is wholesome in each estate to a common end.

This would not be so much the curing of a vice by the exaggeration of a virtue as it might be the healing of an imperfection by the assertion of a quality. To be sure there is a prodigious dissimilarity between the exoteric publicity of a suffragette and the vestal privacy of a cloistered nun. The contrast is acute but the rights of the one do not overshadow the prerogatives of the other.

Shall we ever forget the romantic Victorian woman, sometimes found in fiction like Trollope's, who so gracefully swooned away at the sight of her ecstatic lover? Love was her life and so profoundly reacted on her frail body that smelling-salts were as imperative as victuals. We have ridiculed the delicacy of that Victorian woman because our women are rapidly returning to what Chesterton calls the coarse and candid women of the Elizabethan period. This vulgarity has matured, in some measure, from a merciless mode of civilization which has

thrust the tenderest shoots of feminine flowering into avocations which normally belong to man. The promiscuous dealing of woman, who, is naturally refined, with man, who is naturally a vulgarian, has demoralized the woman. Herein lurks the grim and black humor of woman suffrage. The romantic and esthetic inferiority of the modern man has dragged woman so to the deeps that she is screaming for emotional and economic self-assertion. Is the vote an unction for so wide a wound?

However, there are sedatives for ruffled neurological conditions. Could the equable composure of a cloistered nun be an anodyne to the tense tumultuous life of a suffragette? It must be more than a contrast. The Divine placidity of the one must tender a balm to the feverish spirit of the other. Perhaps there never was a riper era for the reassertion of the feminine contemplative ideal to counteract the ruthless and cruel waste of feminine activities, political and otherwise.

St. Teresa, no mean mistress of the science of life, it was, who declared that more good is done by one minute of reciprocal contemplative communion of love with God, than by the founding of fifty hospitals or even fifty churches. Is the suffragette, who in fine frenzy, discourses in the public square of more sociological value to the community than the cloistered nun, who under the wing of the Sacramental Presence chants her propitiatory and plaintive song, at midnight Matins, by way of atonement for the excesses of our imperfect life? It is but flippant to presume that her heart is narrow because it is cloistered. Indeed it is wider than all the political systems of the world. For as she detached herself from the thraldom of the things of sense, her heart dilated and there was opened a larger horizon. It is not for the suffragette to judge her. She is the judge of her life as is the suffragette.

The tremulous cry of a conductorette in the subway or even the elegant chatter of a feminine gathering at a fashionable hotel betokens an overwrought but doubtless necessary condition. But the mellow and cadenced artlessness of a nun's voice when intoning the Divine Office in the cloister chapel seems as natural as a bird singing in the tree or the cooing of a dove in the clefts of the rocks.

It is a rigid verity that we cannot touch political pitch without being defiled. So the suffragette has lost not only poise, intuition, manner and distinction but another grace, the voice soft and low, that most excellent thing in woman. Can the sacred silences of the cloister be the agency of atonement to stem the floods of vehement verbiage which threatens to inundate the region of sincere thought concerning the dignity of woman?

The loose speech and lax method of ratiocination have not only a reference to feminism but also to Prohibition

and Socialism. That such modes of crooked belief have come into vogue is because we are still immature experimentalists. We have not as yet the perspective sense to look to the sharp realities. As for dispassionate, judicious thinking, we are standing on our heads and not on our heels. Oh! for the "*Homo simplex*" of the Romans, since now the female of the species is more complex and incompetent amongst the ruins in the realm of modern thought.

Yet we are saved by the orisons of the righteous. They avail much. Cloistered nuns are women. Women are still parcel of the redemptive and sacrificial scheme which balances the world. By their stripes we are healed. They die for the many. If the suffragette shall close her eyes to this vision, the cloistered nun cannot, since it is the law of her life. She is therefore not a luxury but a profound social necessity for the feminine ideals of civilization. She is now, more than ever, a rod and a staff for the moral support of the suffragette. This is why the perfection of one finely heroic spirit is of infinitely more worth than the propagation of innumerable ordinary types of the race.

The fashionable, though charitable, society leader at the Waldorf and the militant suffragette storming the White House at Washington are of infinitely less worth as economic factors for amelioration than the cloistered nun kneeling erect in prayer before the Tabernacle. One is all fuss and feathers. She symbolizes the tempest in the tea-pot. But the cloistered nun represents the Divine energy which wraps itself around our helpless world.

Even the Romans, in their period of moral decline, never lost this womanly ideal. The standard of feminine morality ran low, but the discerning spirits insisted that the ideal at least must be held on high. Thus, the vestal virgin plighted her vow of inviolate chastity for one year. Her life was of reparation and possessed all the esoteric exclusiveness of a cloistered nun. She kept aloft the snowy banner of a noble ideal. If she violated her vow she was buried alive. So now, our goodly array of consecrated virgins, be they Teresian contemplatives, Poor Clares or Nuns of the Precious Blood, are by atonement, propitiation, sacrifice, lending an ethical and economic value to the modern devices of the suffragette.

The March to the Rhine

CHAPLAIN JAMES CAREY, U. S. A.

WHAT will be the attitude toward the army of occupation in the land of the enemy? That was the question repeatedly asked and discussed as we approached the German border. Not that our boys feared the enemy. In his most frightful days the enemy never had any terror for American soldiers. They feared nothing, but they expected some surliness, anticipated some sniping on the part of crack-brains, and marched on to find a ready, if not graceful, submission. Early on the misty morning we left the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg at the town of Wasserbillig and crossed over the river Sauer near the spot where it empties into the Moselle. Midway on the bridge a sign informed us that we were stepping into the Kaiser's dominion,

but the Kaiser's now no more. We were in Germany. Nearly opposite the confluence of the rivers on the right bank of the Moselle was a little village apparently asleep. No one was about. Not a sign of life. It did indeed seem that the Germans were keeping under cover at the approach of the invader. So our boys declared as they laughed and joked about it, "Fritz's beat it to his dugout," and many like remarks being couched in American slang. Oh, they are queer fellows these American soldiers. Conscious of the momentousness of their presence as conquerors on the soil of the military Power that would defy and dominate the world, knowing much of the enemy's wiles and resourcefulness; under orders to be on the alert, with an advance patrol scouting ahead, yet, here as always, some wag in the throng finds mirth linked up with majesty and gives expression to it in the soldier lingo. So it was when they were leaving the shores of their homeland. As the steamer moved out of the dock all stood at attention, filled with emotion, the band on the forward deck playing the national anthem. Then some one with a perfectly proper soldierly impropriety started, and all took up the tune, "Goodby, Broadway, Hello, France." Thus it was when they went into battle, and thus it was indeed when they came out of battle, maimed, bruised, bleeding, in torturing pain, yet with a smile on the face and a joke on the lip. The disparity of it was tragic. They see everything with two eyes: reverence and levity.

Yes, they are wonderful men, these American soldiers. There is nothing they would not dare, and do. War was new and foreign to them; they had no love for it, as they had no fear of it. They did their duty, because it was their duty. They have had enough of war; they want no more of it, and they will frankly tell you so, but if it must come they will be ready. They had no eagerness to drink the blood of war, and, thank God, it has left no thirst in them. Paradoxes at every turn, they forgot war and ceased to talk about war when they came into the land of the war-lords. They were disarmed when they came into the country of the enemy, disarmed by little children, and by the simplicity and innocence of them. At one place where we stopped, on the outskirts of a town—paradox again—the people welcomed their conquerors. The children gathered near the soldiers and danced and sang and cut up pranks for them, and the soldiers cut up pranks for the children. And for these soldiers, this encounter did more for the founding of a true League of Nations and for the establishing of an enduring peace than the Conference at Paris is doing. May I say it with all reverence? "Out of the mouths of babes" came welcome. Childishly, spontaneously, unfeignedly, they were reflecting the attitude of their elders; reflecting not hate or hostility but a welcome, the sincerity of which might otherwise have been suspected.

We passed through the city of Triers or Treves, where the legions of Julius Caesar passed long ages ago to be followed by endless other legions down the ages. Here again no manifestation of hostility, no signs of fear or anxiety, "Business as usual," people going on their ways with rather a friendly curiosity at the passing of the troops. Outside of Treves we halted for mess and lined up alongside our rolling kitchens. Here again were the children, only more of them. It was a happy hour for the youngsters, and they showed their gladness when the doughboy shared his mess with them, but not before they were made to say: "Give mir some can villie." "Canned Willie" and "slum," the bugbear of the soldiers in the field, were ambrosia and nectar to these children who had passed years of meatless days. Or they were made to sing what seemed to be a popular song during the war, "*Deutschland auch hat Marmalade*" ("Germany Still Has Sweets or Jam"), a parody on some German air. The people sang this to try to persuade themselves that they had luxuries while England and France had none. No, "*Deutschland hat kein Marmalade*." Sugar was one of the things Germany did not have. Was Germany on the verge of starva-

tion? We could see no signs of it. Emaciated forms and pinched faces were not conspicuous. On the contrary the people of these parts seem to be stockily built and healthy.

However, we were told that many old folks had died from lack of nourishment the last year of the war, and that lack of milk had caused the death of many infants. Moreover the people pretend that the Allies caused the death of the innocents by the blockade of Germany. Black bread is still the only kind obtainable, and this according to government regulation, but it is not unpleasant in taste, and is, I believe, nourishing. Fats and sugar were not to be had. A piece of soap, sold for ten cents in America, costs two dollars or more here, and only a plutocrat could indulge in the luxury of a bar of chocolate. We were told that in other parts of Germany, especially in the industrial centers, conditions were worse, but as far as I can learn, starvation had not come to Germany, but its coming would not have been long delayed had the war continued.

We were billeted for nine days at Pfalzel, just outside of Treves, and here the world-war that had shaken and shattered the pillars of civilization was forgotten in the beauty of the towering hills, the wealth of historic lore, and the monuments of art and antiquity. Julius Caesar seemed nearer to us than Foch or Haig or Pershing. The Theban Legion, martyred for the Faith on the plains of the Campus Martius, just outside the Porta Nigra, majestic even in ruin, seemed more real than the Armistice Commission then holding its sessions in Treves; and the ancient "*gens Treverorum*," the early Christians, and the medieval builders, more interesting than the present *Triereshers*. Another army of occupation had been here before us nearly 2000 years ago, and had left souvenirs in the way of Roman amphitheaters, baths, walls, gates, basilicas, bridges, and so on. The Church, too, has left its mark here in the memory of early apostolic men and women, in historic and artistic edifices, a people strong in faith and morals, a clergy learned and pious, and a saintly, apostolic Bishop whose daring defense of the Church made him the object of attack of the late Kaiser's Government. The Cathedral which is a work of many ages and many minds, going back to the Roman period of the fourth century, must have had a genius for an architect. Who else could have brought such unity and beauty and majesty out of such diversity? It was more frequented and admired than the more admirable *Liebfrauen Kirche*, Our Dear Lady's Church, adjoining it, one of the most lovely, delicate, prayerful Gothic churches in Europe. During the war Treves was attacked by air-craft, and a bomb striking near the Cathedral shattered one of the medieval stained-glass windows. All the other precious windows were removed and stored away for safety in the basement of the Cathedral, and are now replaced by plain substitute windows. Oh! a pang for the precious windows and churches back there in France, and still more precious lives, that are gone beyond repair. Treves had a greater interest and fascination for our soldiers than any other place on our line of march. Our boys are intelligent and have a laudable *curiositas sapiendi*, and the chaplain *sans Baedeker* was obliged to get up "talks" for the men.

Our billet, Pfalzel, in Latin, *Palatiolum*, an outpost of ancient Treves, has likewise a store of historic memories, but they were wholly overshadowed by those of Treves. By right of occupation our troops in Germany are everywhere billeted in houses, but, beyond the terms of the armistice, the men in our towns had beds, yes, real feather beds to sleep in. And so we have found it all along the way. But the people did not stop at this, they cooked and washed and mended for our men, and seemed to find happiness in being of service to them. Of course some would say, and already some have said, that it was just another sample of German guile and trickery. But the American soldier, though he is good-hearted, is no fool. He has seen and knows how far the German military machine can go in intrigue and barbarity, but when he finds some German mother

who has lost her own sons in the war, busying herself for him, doing the homely little things that only a woman can do, anticipating his wishes, mothering him a bit, talk of German trickery and propaganda irritates him.

But billets and beds and little homely bits were not the only good things that came to us here. More fortunate than most regiments, we were ordered to Coblenz by railway. Our men had been wishing and hoping that this last, longest, and hardest lap of the march to the Rhine might be done by rail. Indeed, I think that believer and unbeliever alike were making a novena for this longed-for boon. Our soldier is not a weakling but he is practical enough to prefer riding to walking, when he can get the chance. Besides his rifle, he carries seventy pounds on his back. He cannot wait for the weather on the march, and the weather cannot be ordered for him. He may grumble a bit at ploughing through the mud all day with blistered feet, but a hot supper at night makes him soon forget all that. Our soldier is no "quitter" but he is human. And so there was joy in the regiment when it was announced that we are to make the journey down the beautiful and historic Moselle valley by means of such a modern and unromantic thing as a railway train.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words

Prohibition and the Mass

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As one who has expressed his dissent from other constitutional views which have appeared in your columns on the vital question of Prohibition and the Mass, permit me to command as a sound exposition of the law your editorial of March 1 entitled, "The Mass a Crime, and Priests Criminals." It is undoubtedly true that while the Federal Prohibition Amendment does not make a specific exception of wine for sacramental purposes, yet wine used for that purpose is not within the purview of the Amendment which is directed at intoxicating liquors utilized "for beverage purposes." Wine used for sacramental purposes is not employed for beverage purposes. *De Hasque vs. A. T. and S. F.*, 173 Pac. 73.

On the other hand, it is equally correct, as you suggest, that the Federal Amendment does not deprive a State of the right to make the use of wine for sacramental purposes unlawful. Neither does the Federal Amendment relative to freedom of worship have this effect since it is limitation on Congress and not on the States. However, it should be noted that most, and so far as I know, all of the States have in their constitutions provisions guaranteeing religious freedom to their inhabitants. Under an impartial interpretation this should be sufficient to nullify a State *statute* inhibiting the use of wine for sacramental purpose. It must be admitted, however, that a very respectable argument can be made on the other side and that, therefore, too much faith should not be put in such provisions.

There is one thing, however, very pertinent to this question that is often overlooked. Except for the provisions of the Webb-Kenyon act and the Reed amendment, both Federal laws, no obstacle could be placed in the way of a priest receiving into his possession, even in the most arid territory, wine for sacramental purposes. A vigorous effort should be made to secure the moderation of these laws so as to exclude from their operation shipments of wine for sacramental purposes. This, of course, would not hinder a State from making its possession and use criminal, if the highest court of the State should decide that no provision of the State constitution rendered void such an enactment by the State legislature. However, it is almost inconceivable to think of a priest being arrested because he possesses or uses wine for sacramental purposes. Such an episode would probably be the best solution of the whole question in as much as it would arouse such an outcry and such an outpouring of public indignation as would compel a right settlement of the entire perplexing problem.

In conclusion, permit me to make three suggestions. First, Congress should be importuned to amend the Webb-Kenyon act and the Reed amendment so as to exclude sacramental wine from their operation. Secondly, emphatic demand should be made that Congress be careful expressly to except wine for sacramental purposes from the definition of intoxicating liquors which it will soon be called upon to formulate. Lastly, the State legislatures should be carefully watched in order to prevent any extreme State legislation that would prevent the possession or use of wine for sacramental purposes.

Tulsa, Okla.

H. H. HAGAN.

[Mr. Hagan writes that "wine used for that purpose [the Mass] is not within the purview of the Amendment, which is directed at intoxicating liquors utilized for beverage purposes. Wine used for sacramental purposes is not employed for beverage purposes. *De Hasque vs. A. T. and S. F.*, 173 Pac. 73." But, as Mr. Hagan remarks in another connection, "a very respectable argument can be made on the other side." First, as the judgment of a State court, the *De Hasque* ruling would not be paramount in an action under Federal legislation passed by authority of the Eighteenth Amendment. At best, it would create only a weak precedent. Secondly, by root-meaning and in point of fact, a beverage is something that is taken by way of drink; whether the drinking be for the pleasure attached thereto, or for other reasons.

Next, it is true, as Mr. Hagan says, that most "if not all of the States have in their constitutions provisions guaranteeing religious freedom for their inhabitants." It should be noted, however, first, that unlike the great Federal instrument, a State constitution is a document that can be changed with comparative ease, and next, that an act deemed by law contrary to public order, cannot be protected by the State religious-liberty guarantees. Thus, for instance, a man may not beat a drum at a crowded street corner, in defiance of city ordinance, even though this method of attracting a congregation be prescribed by his religion, nor may he practise the Mormon code of marriage, or run naked through the streets, as the Fifth Monarchy men did, or commit other acts, held to be against the public peace, and then plead in defense, that these violations of law, commanded by his religion, are protected by the State religious-liberty guarantee. Catholics know that there is no parity between these acts and the use of wine in the Holy Sacrifice. This view, however, could hardly be adopted by a court sitting in a State which had legislated against the use of wine for any and all purposes, on the ground that, while operating incidentally against a certain religious practice, the measure was necessary for the due enforcement of the Prohibition law.

All this, however, only leads up to a complete concurrence in Mr. Hagan's contention that it is not wise to expose the Holy Sacrifice to any hazard. Precisely because the matter is otherwise vague and therefore dangerous, the Webb-Kenyon act and the Reed Amendment should be so changed as to allow specifically the use of wine for the Holy Sacrifice, and this specific exception should be inserted in all State and Federal legislation adopted in connection with the Eighteenth Amendment.—ED. AMERICA.]

The Economic Saviors of the World

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It seems to me that one of the most perilous situations that the human race could be placed in would be to have every man and woman in the world wake up, some fine morning, millionaires. The whole working world might then come to a standstill, and might remain that way just long enough to let starvation come to every door. Imagine idleness for all the laborers on the farms and in the fields; in the mines and in the lumber camps and on the stock ranges; in the ships at sea; and in the mills and factories, and in all the other places where human hands

are daily and hourly ministering to the needs of human life. Who are the men and women that toil and sweat in those places? They are not millionaires. No, indeed. Catch a perspiring millionaire in any of those places! They are the poor. Why do the poor take upon themselves those hazardous and onerous and menial tasks? Because necessity impels them. Because they need the money. But if they should suddenly find themselves overburdened with money, why should they labor for it any longer? And if they had to anyhow, how discontented they would be!

A danger almost equally as great as the foregoing, it seems to me, would be to have all men and women in the world wake up some fine morning and find themselves university graduates. How their tastes for work would change! Who would do the world's hard work then? Who does it now? Will your university lady's thoughts turn toward the washtub, or the shirt factory, or the kitchen, or the department store, as a means of livelihood? Maybe, if there is nothing else in sight, or if her character is as great as her education. Yet, with all her higher education, the university young lady must have clothes, and clean clothes, and things to eat. She would have to make her clothes, and wash them too, and peel and cook and scrub, if her grammar-grade sisters, whom she may be thoughtless enough to despise as "ignorant," were no longer compelled by their lack of higher education to seek their livelihood in lowly callings.

So with your man, schooled to the top notch. He would have to dig his own sewer, and put his soft hands to many another disagreeable task, if there were no "uneducated person" willing to take the job.

"The poor you have always with you." I am inclined to believe that Our Lord's meaning there is: "The poor you *must* always have with you: the poor in worldly goods, and the poor in learning." I am inclined to believe that God, in His wisdom, intends that the great majority shall be poor, in both senses, in order that the work of the world may be done, the manifold work so absolutely indispensable for the material life of humanity. The poor, in God's Providence, are the economic saviors of the world. They can be its saviors, too, in another sense, namely, if well grounded in the elements of their religion, by leavening the other great mass of workers with whom they mix.

We need not worry over any dearth of wealthy Catholics. We have about as many now as are good for us. Possibly, some of your contributors, who have been pleading for the "higher education" of Catholics, will be ready to burn me at the stake, if you print this communication, and their eyes fall on what I have said about university graduates. They need not worry about any lack of highly-educated Catholics either. The Lord will look out for that. "The Lord hath need of them," that is, of the great majority to do the world's work. He will supply all the educated ones we need by giving them, in due season, the desire for the higher studies.

San Francisco.

T. P. H.

The French Orphans

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The local court of the "Daughters of Isabella" wishes to contribute its share to the worthy cause of helping French widows to give a Catholic education to their children. Is there an organization which guarantees thoroughly Catholic education, which has an agency in this country or in France and is responsible to proper Church authorities?

CATHERINE FLEMING.

Grand Regent, Daughters of Isabella,
Fargo, No. Dakota. Court St. Ann, No. 261.

[The *Oeuvre des Bons Enfants* is under the direct supervision and control of Cardinal Amette, the Archbishop of Paris; it deserves the generous and enthusiastic support of American Catholics. Contributions may be sent to the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph Freri, D.C.L., 343 Lexington Avenue, New York.—ED AMERICA.]

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1919

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BRENN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The School Plus the Home

MANY Europeans marvel at the sacrifices American Catholics make to maintain their magnificent school system. We patiently bear the burden of a double education tax in order that our boys and girls may receive the religious training that is their right. But the best Catholic school there is cannot, of course, fully supply the deficiencies of a home that is not pervaded by the Catholic atmosphere. If children can scarcely avoid noticing that their parents' daily life is governed by principles that obviously contradict those that the little ones learn at the Catholic school, the teacher's task is made exceedingly hard and discouraging, for only too often she beholds the good done the children at school quite nullified by what goes on at home. Apropos of this familiar difficulty Catholic teachers have to meet, a writer in the New Zealand *Tablet* well says:

The Catholic Church never ceases to point out to her children their duty to oppose by every means in their power the tide of materialism and corruption which is sweeping civilization off the earth. We have our schools which are a splendid and public protest against the infidelity of our legislators and their disregard for God's laws; and as long as the Church remains children will be taught in her schools to reverence law and morality and to esteem self-denial more than self-indulgence. But the schools cannot do everything: even Catholic schools cannot wholly counteract evil influences. It is incumbent on the parents to co-operate with the Church and with the schools and to do their part in the home circle. If bad habits are formed in early years all that teachers can do will not eradicate them. Catholic schools are sometimes very unjustly blamed for the failure of their pupils to live up to the standard of a good Christian; but as a rule the failure is not due to the school: it is in spite of the school. What can the school do in a few years if the home life is corrupt and un-Christian, and if parents have set their children a bad example from the beginning? God knows what a crime such parents are guilty of and how terrible an account they will have to render for the souls of their children. The early training is the most important, and it is never too early to teach the habits of self-denial and restraint upon which the char-

acter is built. Childhood is the true seed-time, and the harvest depends on the parents. And what a harvest: "Sow an act, reap a habit; sow a habit, reap a character; sow a character, reap a destiny." Not only the destiny of the individual but that of the nation depends on home influence.

Without question many a Catholic father or mother can find in the foregoing passage fruitful matter for Lenten reflections. For outside the Church it is considered nowadays so unpardonable a crime to arrest the development of a child's "sacred individuality" that boys and girls of tender years are permitted such freedom from guidance and restraint in choosing their schools, their books, their companions, and their amusements, that most parents, it is clear, have fully abdicated their thrones and left the kingdom of their children's hearts in foolish, inexperienced hands. Catholic fathers and mothers, however, cannot thus neglect their duty toward the children whom God has given them to bring up for Him. To that admirable slogan, "Every Catholic child in a Catholic school," therefore, let another now be added, viz., "Every Catholic child in a thoroughly Catholic home." But a thoroughly Catholic home is one in which the parents both apply to their own lives, and also keep in mind while training their little ones, the uncompromisingly Catholic principles which the children are taught in the Catholic school.

"Taking it Easy" at Yale

AN American educator remarked some years ago, that we spend more money on the public schools and get a smaller return from the investment, than any other people on earth. He did not add that in this our traditional keen business sense seemed to desert us, but ascribed the loss to our lack of "educational ideals." We were generous in spending money, but we really did not know what we wanted to buy. Perseverance and a good intention were our sole virtues. Hence we eagerly purchased fad after fad, hoping that somewhere, some day, we might come across an article that bore the hall mark of education.

If the recent action of Yale in eliminating Latin from the subjects required for entrance to the arts course, may be taken as a symptom, it would appear that we have lost the two homely virtues which once characterized our earnest, if somewhat amusing, educational efforts. So far as can be ascertained from the action of the corporation, Yale has dropped Latin, not because Latin is no longer deemed worthy a place on an educational program, but because Latin is too hard. It therefore reduces the number of students, and small colleges do not pay. As the Boston *Transcript*, no unfriendly critic, expresses the case:

The decision to drop Latin will be good news to many high schools and to many boys who find the present road to Yale too hard to travel. In acting as it does the corporation frankly recognizes the fact that Yale is not getting all the students it thinks it ought to get. . . . That is a condition which the reorganization plan aims to remove.

To require any student to work, is, of course, a fearful mistake. In a program intended to fit young men to fight for a place in an exceedingly hard and chilly world, nothing "hard" should be included. On the contrary, "Take it up, if it's easy; and drop it, if it's hard," should henceforth be the motto at Yale, and the young men should be so imbued with its supreme importance that they will spontaneously act upon it after receiving their diplomas. They will then stand a splendid chance, not precisely of succeeding in this busy, hard-headed world, but of finding themselves, sooner or later, in a penitentiary or a poorhouse.

The easiest way is usually the hardest way in the end. If the war taught anything, it taught the value of hard work and the imperative need of restraint and sacrifice. But the lesson escaped Yale, which proposes to attract young men by letting down the bars of strict requirement. Obviously, the argument tells equally against higher mathematics and the sciences, for which, if the students continue to "find the road too hard to travel," Yale may very consistently substitute courses in knitting and golf. Had the corporation closed the doors to Latin because they deemed it an unsuitable subject, or a subject less suitable than many others, in a course for the bachelor's degree in arts, the decision might be regretted, but it could at least be respected. But Yale excluding Latin because it is too "hard," is a spectacle that ought to make American "educators" hang their heads in shame.

Orphan Asylums and the Press

LAST week several New York newspapers published a tale of cruelty, the scene of which was laid in a Protestant orphan asylum. A boy of fifteen, so ran the story, had been beaten frequently with a section of garden hose, and on several occasions chained up at night. No attempt was made to "sensationalize" the narrative, and besides carefully noting that a full report would be filed with the county authorities by the superintendent, the accounts added that in several important points the boy's charges could not be verified. The superintendent's defense has now been published, and one paper even went so far as to send a special representative to visit the institution. The investigator writes that the boy bears no trace whatever of a brutal punishment supposed to have been inflicted only two weeks ago, that the institution seems to be conducted in an admirable manner, and finally, that a number of boys, when questioned without the knowledge of the superintendent, readily answered that they "were always treated fine." All this is as it should be. If the sorry story had to be told at all, and the almost unbearable burdens of institutional work made much harder by the hasty publication of uninvestigated charges, it was only in accord with the minimum demand of justice that the accused be allowed his day in court.

The whole incident, but particularly the conduct of the New York newspapers, reveals an almost startling

change from the eagerness of the press in 1916 to spread calumny against the Catholic institutions. Space in a metropolitan newspaper is said to be scarce, but all of them had space enough for first-page headlines in which to herald abominable charges against priests and nuns. Quite in keeping with their vicious program, they had no space at all for any refutation of these diabolical falsehoods. The institutions might protest that, both by law and their own invitation, they were always open to inspection, that they would be glad to have the public visit the children, talk with them, examine the buildings and equipment, and thus discover for themselves what the actual conditions were. But the protest was in vain. The accusers of the Catholic institutions were judge and jury, and aspired to the office of public hangman. All this the New York newspapers knew well, but they were also aware that the hand raised against the institutions was the hand from which they might look to receive many a financial token. Therefore, whatever the truth involved in the case, they proposed to take no chances by giving the institutions a hearing.

To conclude that the New York newspapers of 1919 have experienced a complete change of heart would be purely erroneous. It may be admitted, however, that all, without exception, will tell the truth, reluctantly, when forced by threat of legal proceedings, and gladly, when the truth promises to pay better. One or other of these contingencies probably brought about the publication of the superintendent's defense in the present controversy. The incident has no further significance. The New York newspapers are conducted for the sole and exclusive purpose of returning a financial profit, and that is the sordid end of the matter.

Joseph Frey

OF men who have passed into the world where God alone is judge, it is customary to write that the world is poorer for their going. Often conceived in simple kindness, the epitaph is rarely wholly false. However devoid of gracious qualities in the eyes of a censorious world, there are brighter moments in the life of every man, when he is ruled by impulses for good. It is a kindly philosophy which teaches that these moments outnumber the dark periods of evil, and where there is so much kindness we suspect an underlying foundation of truth as well as charity. The good that men do, small as it is, is not lost, for, as Monsignor Benson has finely said, God does not waste His material. Just as no physical force is wholly dissipated, even though its form be changed, so the occasional generous act that makes sharp contrast in a life of darkness, may somewhere plead with a Judge, juster because He is kinder, and find its due effect.

But of Joseph Frey, it is not mere kindness but simple truth, to write that the world in which he moved now feels a deep sense of loss because he has gone away. In him, the generous, self-forgetting act was the rule of

a long and laborious life. His early years were not cast in pleasant places. From his youth upward, he was a toiler. He had none of the opportunities that good men have found in wealth, social position, and the advantages of a university training. But he was a man, with the strong, enduring qualities of mind and heart, which raised him above untoward accidental circumstances, too often the blight or ruin of weaker natures. He did not seek publicity, but did the work at hand, and did it well. He did not find his opportunities thrust upon him, but made them. He, if any man, fully grasped the Divine philosophy that the smallest thing done for the least of Christ's brethren is ennobled by the fact that it is a service done to the King of kings. Papal honors came to him, the love of his fellows, the high respect of associates who differed with him in essential points of faith and social creed, yet recognized instinctively the genuine goodness of the man. But the good he wrought is his secret, yet not his, but God's. The kindly word that put new hope into a cheerless life, the hearty word of confidence that stabilized incautious youth wavering between good and evil courses, the thousand little acts of charity known only to those whose broken lives were through them reconstructed; that story is written, not in human archives, but in the great book of God.

God send us many men like Joseph Frey. The world is in sore need of men who neither theorize nor sulk, but with whatever materials may be at hand, forget themselves and work for God and for God's humblest children.

Bolshevist and Trade Unionist

ACARTOONIST in the Seattle *Post-Intelligencer* significantly presents the present labor issue. A marble monument, firmly based, majestically planned and executed with consummate skill is pictured as partly pried loose from its pedestal. At its foot stands a Bolshevik laborer, trying to shatter its base beneath the vandal blows of his hammer. The symbol wrought in stone is emblematic of a true, constructive labor unionism. It represents the figure of a strong woman, nobly conceived by the artist, dignified, intelligent, alert, with a child standing at her knee. Her head is lifted upward in serious thought and earnest purpose, while her eyes are eagerly questing the heavens for guidance. Her right hand upholds a flaming torch, not the symbol of anarchy and destruction but of popular enlightenment; her left holds, in strong and graceful poise, the massive oval of her protecting shield on which are recorded the immediate demands, made by her for the safeguarding of the worker's home: collective bargaining, industrial insurance, minimum wage and an eight-hour day.

"Erected through years of constructive effort on the part of the workers and dedicated to further their just interests," is the legend inscribed on the pedestal. Yet the majestic dignified figure of a free, democratic, self-restrained labor unionism will topple to its ruin unless

the hand that violates it will be stayed. "After years of patient toil a constructive monument of the achievements of organized labor was built, and each year finds more and valuable additions made to our masterpiece," says the *Carpenter* in reproducing this drawing. It is true that the ideal of labor unionism that it symbolizes is not fully realized, particularly on its religious side, yet in part at least it has been achieved. And is all this to be destroyed, ideal and achievement alike? And for what? Such is the question asked by the organ of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

Standing by with idle hands, as the artist pictures the background of his scene, is a crowd of workers, men and women, whom starvation and despair may at any moment drive to deeds of violence. But this is neither more nor less than part of the cunningly devised plan as conceived by unscrupulous labor leaders. In the distance loom the black scaffoldings of incompletely structures against the dark skies. "Throw away your constitution and strike with your class!" is the cry sent up to the labor unionist by a blatant press, supported out of the money of the anarchist rich, while the same demand comes in a rising treble from the red revolutionists, the Socialist and Bolshevik societies.

It is not through anarchy that the laborer can achieve his end, but by a sane progressive system of trade unionism that will not disregard the dictates of religion; by a rightful use of the ballot which shall assure him the legislative measures that can safely and surely help to bring about a true democracy in industry as in politics; and finally by a gradual education in cooperative enterprises that will enable him to take an intelligent part in the ownership and management of the means of production on which his livelihood depends. So alone may we hope for peace, contentment and popular prosperity.

What the Fanatics Have Done

AT a dinner given the Governor of New York by a non-political society, four men of note referred to the growing power of the Federal Government. The President of Fordham University drew attention to the attempt, evidenced by the Smith bill, to control the local schools; the editor of the *New York World*, the Governor of New York, and Mr. Charles E. Hughes, commented on the transfer of the State's police power to the Federal Government, through the Eighteenth Amendment. A government in control of the local schools and the local police power, whatever it may be, is surely not the Government contemplated by the Constitution.

Individual liberty, [said Mr. Hughes] can only be made secure by the supremacy of local governments in their own affairs. The respect for the necessity of local self-government has been seriously menaced in recent days. Difficult as it may now be, we must preserve the principles of that government. The fanatics have done more than put an end to the open saloon. They seem to have put an end to the Constitution.

Literature

Sonnets of the Spirit.

A FEW days before the Mother Superior summoned her nuns to the chapter-room for another *collatio*, she had a notice read in the refectory inviting each member of the community to bring a copy of her favorite sonnet to the gathering. So at the time set for the *collatio*, the Sisters, many of them wearing a very imperfectly concealed air of expectation, and each bearing a page of manuscript, took their allotted places in the chapter-room. The Mother Superior entered last of all and on being seated, beamed on the nuns and said:

"The subject-matter of this *collatio*, Sisters, could well be termed 'The Sonnets of the Spirit.' While we hold, of course, that piety or 'Godliness is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come,' it must be owned, nevertheless, that it is by no means easy to blend artistically piety and poetry. Either the piety, as so often happens in the voluminous verses of nuns, stifles the poetry, or the poetry, as is frequently the case with worldly-minded bards, is loath to seek its inspiration in piety. But I like to think that every Sister of our community, loving as she does true poetry only next after solid piety, has brought to this *collatio* a poem which will furnish as much food for the soul as for the mind. Shakespeare's 146th Sonnet, for example, if I may begin the holy exercise we are here to share in, admirably unites in my opinion, poetry and piety. The lines you remember, run:

Poor soul, the center of my sinful earth,
Foil'd by those rebel powers that thee array,
Why dost thou pine within, and suffer dearth,
Painting thy outward walls so costly gay?
Why so large cost, having so short a lease,
Dost thou upon thy fading mansion spend?
Shall worms, inheritors of this excess,
Eat up thy charge? Is this thy body's end?
Then, soul, live thou upon thy servant's loss,
And let that pine to aggravate thy store;
Buy terms Divine in selling hours of dross;
Within be fed, without be rich no more:
So shalt thou feed on death, that feeds on men,
And death once dead, there's no more dying then.

"I find that sonnet rich in Lenten meditation-matter. Investing the fortress of my soul are many rebellious, smooth-spoken, fleshly enemies against whom I must ever be on my guard. My body, moreover, the poet then reminds me, is only a tenement of painted clay which I must not waste time adorning for I shall have to leave it in a little while. Rather, he admonishes me, behave toward your body like a stern householder who exacts from a lazy, insolent servant years and years of expiatory labor and suffering that profit no one but the householder. Or let the soul be like a ruthless creditor who forces the debtor body to convert all its property into imperishable gold which is handed over to the soul as her everlasting possession. These are the 'terms Divine' by which every good thing we do or say or think, while we remain in God's grace as prisoners here of our flesh, augments our store of merit in heaven. These are a few of the lessons Shakespeare's beautiful sonnet teaches me. Now let us hear Sister Dorothy's favorite poem."

"I find it hard to choose between Shakespeare's 'Like as the waves make toward the pebbled shore' and Sir Philip Sidney's 'Leave me, O Love, which reachest but to dust,'" said Sister Dorothy. "The first sonnet beautifully describes 'Time's thievish progress to eternity,' and this bids me gain all the merit I can before the night cometh. But it is a remarkable coincidence, Mother, that the sonnet of Shakespeare's gallant contemporary seems to dwell on the very thought you were pursuing just now. So let me read Sidney's lines:

Leave me, O Love, which reachest but to dust;
And thou, my mind, aspire to higher things;
Grow rich in that which never taketh rust;
Whatever fades, but fading pleasure brings.
Draw in thy beams, and humble all thy might
To that sweet yoke where lasting freedoms be,
Which breaks the clouds and opens forth the light,
That doth both shine and give us light to see.
O take fast hold; let that light be thy guide
In this small course which birth draws out to death.
And think how evil becometh him to slide
Who seeketh heaven, and comes of heavenly breath.
Then farewell, world; thy uttermost I see:
Eternal Love, maintain thy life in me.

"'Grow rich in that which never taketh rust'; is the solemn warning that this sonnet, like yours, Mother, gives me. Then the poet melodiously admonishes me that 'Whatever fades, but fading pleasure brings,' and bids me seek true liberty for my soul in the Cross of Christ. To me the rest of the sonnet is an admirable description of the nature and effects of Divine grace, and a strong reminder of what an unworthy thing it would be for a maiden of my high connections—for owing to the troth I have plighted, I am a royal princess—to hanker after the fleeting pleasures of the world I have renounced."

"When Sir Philip wrote that sonnet," said the Superior with a smile, "I fancy he had no intention of furnishing a Papistical nun with any such profitable thoughts as those you have so well expressed, Sister Dorothy. Nor would that other Elizabethan poet, Edmund Spenser, when he wrote his fine Easter Day sonnet, have found much comfort in the reflection that a Popish daughter of Erin like me is wont to use with great spiritual profit his prayer:

And grant that we, for whom Thou diddest die,
Being with Thy dear Blood clean washed from sin,
May live forever in felicity.

For Spenser had little love for Irish Catholics. Sister Benigna, read us your favorite sonnet now."

"A poem I found in George Herbert, that seventeenth-century minister who was rather given to 'conceits,'" said Sister Benigna, "is like another golden link lengthening the chain of poesy you began, Mother, and Sister Dorothy continued. It runs:

Lord, with what care hast Thou begirt us round!
Parents first season us; then schoolmasters
Deliver us to laws; they send us bound
To rules of reason, holy messengers.
Pulpits and Sundays, sorrow dogging sin,
Affliction sorted, anguish for all sizes,
Fine nets and stratagems to catch us in,
Bibles laid open, millions of surprises.
Blessings beforehand, ties of gratefulness,
The sound of glory ringing in our ears;
Without, our shame; within, our consciences;
Angels and grace, eternal hopes and fears.
Yet all these fences and their whole array
One cunning bosom-sin blows quite away.

"There the poet lists and catalogues, it is clear, a number of the external and internal graces with which God is accustomed to keep near or to win back to Him, poor foolish man, whom the witchery of this world's nonsense so often leads astray. The helps to heaven and the aids to sanctity I have in the cloister of course are far more numerous and powerful than even those the poet describes. For daily I assist at Mass and receive Holy Communion, and as long as I live I shall be so strengthened and hallowed by my vows, my rule, my convent prayers and the winning virtues of my Sisters, that never, I hope, will any 'cunning bosom sin' rob me of my Heavenly Bridegroom's love."

"May your fair hopes be realized, Sister Benigna," exclaimed

the Superior fervently. "And I am confident they will be, if you but go on as you are. For to every religious who has taken as her watchword, as you seem to have done, those striking lines in Wordsworth's sonnet on King's College Chapel, Cambridge:

"Give all thou canst, high Heaven rejects the lore.
Of nicely calculated less or more,"

it will surely be granted to make a holy end. I see that Sister Dolores there has a sonnet to read."

"Mine is from Archbishop Trench," said the nun addressed, "and it admirably appraises in my opinion, the value of a single eye and well-shepherded thoughts. Here it is:

A wretched thing it were, to have our heart
Like a broad highway or a populous street,
Where every idle thought has leave to meet,
Pause, or pass on, as in an open mart;
Or like some road-side pool, which no nice art
Has guarded that the cattle may not beat
And foul it with a multitude of feet,
Till of the heavens it can give back no part.
But keep thou thine a holy solitude;
For He, who would walk there, would walk alone;
He who would drink there, must be first endued
With single right to call that stream His own,
Keep thou thine heart close-fastened, unrevealed,
A fenced garden and a fountain sealed.

"The poet also reminds me that the more pure, recollected and peaceful my heart is, the more faithfully will the Divine perfections be mirrored there. Then when I recall that my life is a cloistered, consecrated one, I find that the sonnet's ebbing sextet brings to a nun like me, a message more full of meaning than it brings to most readers. For if there is a heart that should be always kept like a sealed fountain in which the Lord of All, whenever He comes, can see an unspoiled reflection of His loveliness, surely it is the pure, unruffled hearts of dedicated maidens like us."

"Without question, that is a beautiful sonnet, Sister Dolores," said the Mother Superior, "and let me tell you what consolation it gives me to find all the nuns in this convent such flawless mirrors of our Institute in their hunger for holiness and in their zeal for the neighbor's spiritual good. A sonnet, 'On a Photograph,' by R. Wilton, which I chanced to see the other day, seems to be such a faithful description of all the Sisters here, that you must let me read it:"

Since through the open window of the eye
The unconscious secret of the soul we trace,
And character is written on the face,
In this sun-picture what do we descry?
An artless innocence, and purpose high
To tread the pleasant paths of truth and grace,
To tend each flower of duty in its place,
Smile with the gay and comfort those who sigh.
Dear maiden, let a poet breathe the prayer
That God may keep thee still, in all thy ways,
Spotless in heart as those in face art fair;
And may the gentle current of thy days
Make music even from the stones of care,
And murmur with an undersong at praise.

WALTER DWIGHT, S. J.

REVIEWS

Outlines of Medieval History. By C. W. PREVITÉ ORTON, M. A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$3.00.

It is rarely one meets a more interesting or in many respects a fairer book than the one Mr. Orton has woven about his theme: "the human strivings and the wild but purposeful convulsions by which Modern Europe was made," "395 A. D.-1492 A. D." The book abounds in clever and interesting touches that often shed more light on important points than many another book's longer-drawn-out narrative. The prominence in the late war of the subject-races and long-neglected nationalities of Austria-Hungary and Russia necessitates a fuller and more appreciative account of them than the bare mention they have hith-

erto generally received in historical compendiums. Mr. Orton has recognized this fact and gives very satisfactory outlines of these nations once conspicuous and now we hope permanently conspicuous again.

The bitter conflict between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair with its momentous consequences is rather fully treated, and while not doing complete justice to the much-maligned Pontiff, Mr. Orton does point out clearly the malicious and unscrupulous means used by his antagonist to secure by deception public support, a trick, according to the author, that has never failed of imitators among unprincipled politicians and publicists ever since.

The book has two main defects. The first is the inadequate space given to institutions, movements, or events of far-reaching importance, such as medieval universities and education, medieval art and philosophy, commerce, industry and gild-life, the Inquisition, the Black Death, etc., as compared with topics of more purely political and racial interest. The second defect is the treatment often accorded to topics ecclesiastical. It is true that in many places generous praise is given the Church. For example, we read: "The Church first showed Medieval Europe what organization meant; . . . Its influence, too, whether through Pope or local bishop or monastery was for good in the main. They upheld, on the whole, a juster, a more civilized and self-restrained, a more humane and righteous way of acting." . . . The Church "taught asceticism not apathy, . . . Hermits, monks and friars were energetic folks." On the other hand, in numerous places occur statements and strictures misleading and exaggerated if not wholly false and unfounded. The origin and character of the Papacy especially is a frequent stone of stumbling.

Thus the author repeats the traditional "stuff" about the Decretals of the False Isidore, affirming that "Nicholas I eagerly adopted the whole theory of the Forged Decretals, and acted on it with success," and this, too, against Protestants like Wells, in "The Age of Charlemagne," and Hinschius in "*Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*," not to mention hosts of Catholic writers such as Rocquain, Jungmann, De Smedt and Roy. Mr. Orton's whole theory of the enlargement of Papal claims during the Middle Ages would suffer a rude shock were he but to read the letters of Pope St. Gelasius I (492-496 A. D.). Again Leo IX (1049-1054) is gravely set down as the "founder of the Papal ecclesiastical monarchy"; and the hoary fiction of the ancient Irish Church's independence of Rome is once more served up. In general, as regards the Church, Mr. Orton, like most Protestant writers, needs either more painstaking and fearless research, or greater fearlessness in meeting and recording the results of such research. Perhaps he needs both.

J. F. X. M.

A Commentary on Canon Law. Volume Two, Clergy and Hierarchy; Volume Three, *De Personis*, of Ecclesiastical Persons, Religious and Laymen. By the Rev. CHAS. AUGUSTINE, O.S.B., D.D. St. Louis: B. Herder. \$2.50 each.

Handbook of Canon Law for Congregations of Women under Simple Vows. By D. I. LANSLORS, O.S.B. Eighth Edition, Revised, and Enlarged to Conform with the New Code of Canon Law. New York: Frederick Pustet. \$1.50.

Marriage Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law. By Very Rev. H. A. AYRINHAC, S.S., D.D., D.C.L. New York: Benziger Brothers. \$2.00.

The codification of Canon Law was an achievement of immense importance not merely for Catholics, but for the world in general, and it will always remain a monument to the practical, high-minded wisdom of the Divine institution which to a far greater extent than any other agency has helped to civilize the world. With the notes of Cardinal Gasparri, the New Code has an interest both for jurists and for historians; but

a knowledge of its provisions is now a strict necessity, if not in their entirety at least in part, for those who are charged with applying it to actual life. The four volumes here grouped together are of special value, for they give a brief, clear, satisfactory explanation of the law of the Church on questions for the most part of daily occurrence.

Father Augustine's books are further instalments of the complete commentary which is to take six volumes, the first of which was favorably reviewed in AMERICA for August 31, 1918. They have the same general excellence and are constructed on the same plan, each canon being quoted in the original and then explained at length with copious references. They deal with the persons that make up the Church; clerics, members of the Hierarchy, religious and lay persons. Father Lanslots' treatise, like the third volume of Father Augustine's, is especially useful for those who have to deal with religious. It is not an entirely new work, but a revision of his previous practical study of the laws regarding religious as laid down by the Constitution "*Condite a Christo*," and the "*Normae*," which was reviewed in AMERICA for May 22, 1909. The work in its latest form does not follow the order of the Code but of the *Normae*, incorporating into the text the rulings of the Code where they supplement or modify former legislation. Its value as a handbook is undoubted, but it is to be regretted that the author has not added the topical index suggested by reviewers. Father Ayrinhac's book deserves the praise bestowed upon it by Archbishop Hanna in the preface, for it is learned, complete, accurate and clear; it points out the differences between the old and the new legislation, and indicates the historical development of the Church's legislation. The translation of the canons is designed to be a help, but is of course not authoritative, for an authoritative solution recourse must be had to the original. The book will prove a great help to the busy pastor.

J. H. F.

Meditations Without Method. Considerations Concerning the Character and Teaching of Christ. Arranged as an Informal Three Days' Retreat. By WALTER DIVER STRAPPINI, S.J. Second edition. \$1.80. **Mater Christi.** Meditations on Our Lady. By MOTHER ST. PAUL, House of Retreats, Birmingham. With a Preface by Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J. \$1.25. **Restoration to the Sacred Heart.** By the Author of "The Vocation of the Soul." \$1.00. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Here are three little books of piety that are out in time to be used this Lent. Father Strappini's triduum begins with "second-week" material, opening with a meditation on "The Word Made Flesh," which is followed by one on "His Mother Mary." The pages on St. Mary Magdalene are particularly rich in fresh and practical reflections, the chapters on Gethsemane and on the Good Thief are full of solid Lenten thoughts, "Gennesaret and Peace" contains an Easter message, and there are also three instructions on every-day asceticism. The book can be used for profitable spiritual reading.

Mother St. Paul's little volume follows the life of Our Lady, after the Ignatian method, from her Immaculate Conception to her Coronation in heaven, preludes, colloquies and orderly points, all being set down. The book's style is familiar and the reflections practical. "Restoration to the Sacred Heart" bears evidences of coming from a High Anglican's pen, but there is little in the book that a Catholic could not have written. "There are some," the author remarks, "who, untrue to our English Church, make rules for their spiritual children of compulsory confession," as a necessary preparation, it would seem for frequent communicants' receiving worthily. But of that the author disapproves. She is such a lover of the "sacraments," that it is not unlikely that she will be a genuine Catholic before long, unless she sins grievously against the light God seems to be giving her.

W. D.

The Irish Republic. Why? Official Statement Prepared for Submission to the Peace Conference by LAURENCE GINNELL, Barrister of the Middle Temple and Irish Bar. Representative of North Westmeath in the *Dail Eireann* (Parliament of the Irish Republic), Member of the Committee Appointed by Seán Fein for the Drafting of Ireland's Case. 1482 Broadway, New York: The Friends of Irish Freedom. \$0.25; \$20.00 a hundred.

This is a keen Irish lawyer's well-reasoned brief for the new Republic. It was written during the author's detention in Mountjoy Prison, Dublin, where the British Government had incarcerated him for his Sinn Feinism, and from which he succeeded in smuggling out his book after finishing it last July. Basing his argument chiefly on the history of England's occupation of Ireland, Mr. Ginnell draws up against Great Britain a strong indictment under fourteen heads, which should be submitted, he pleads, to the Peace Conference. He maintains and proves:

That Ireland is historically entitled to independence as one of the primary sovereign States of Christendom; that Ireland's constitutional right is supported by her meritorious record when independent; that Ireland is inherently entitled to sovereign independence and international recognition; that Ireland possesses adequate potential man-power to maintain sovereign independence once established; that Ireland is apt for industries and trade as an independent State; that Ireland is financially able to discharge the duties of an independent State; that Ireland is entitled to the right of self-preservation against England's policy of extermination; that independent Ireland's purposes are those of peace and progress; that Ireland's independence is essential to the freedom of the seas; that England is unfit to rule Ireland; that Ireland claims recognition and intervention by the Peace Conference, restitution and reparation by England and an international guarantee for her future security.

Mr. Ginnell quotes a British commission's statement that England, from the year 1800 to 1914, drew from Ireland in excessive taxation the sum of £400,000,000, is now extracting from that unhappy country an annual revenue of £27,000,000 over and above what the efficient government and defense of Ireland should cost, and he suggests that England now restore to the new Irish Republic the sum of £500,000,000. It would seem that every fair-minded man who has mastered the arguments in Mr. Ginnell's little book and in Dr. Maloney's pamphlet on "The Irish Issue," published by the America Press, cannot help becoming a convinced Sinn Feiner.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The contents of the *Catholic Mind* for April 8 should be of special interest to doctors. James J. Walsh, M.D., contributes a good sketch of Bishop Theodoric of Lucca, a thirteenth-century "Pioneer of Surgery," who wrote a treatise on his art which reads almost as if it were composed yesterday, so remarkably "modern" are the operations he successfully performed. Cardinal Bourne's excellent sermon on "The Catholic Physician" follows, in which he emphasizes the spiritual side of the doctor's calling. Archbishop Ireland's thoughtful address on "The Love of Books," which he gave his seminarians is reprinted, for it contains many useful counsels for the general reader as well, and the issue ends with "The Drift of the Age," some profitable Lenten reflections from Bishop Van De Ven's pastoral, in which he calls attention to the sad inroads worldliness and love of pleasure are making today on Catholic faith and purity.

Readers of AMERICA who in these times of social unrest are eager to know the books that will give the Catholic position on the questions and issues now being discussed, will no doubt be glad to have at hand the following list of works:

"Catholic Democracy, Individualism and Socialism," by Henry Day, S.J. (Longmans); "The Key to the World's

Progress," and "Political Economy," by Charles Stanton Devas (Longmans); "The World Problem: Capital, Labor and the Church," by Joseph Husslein, S.J. (Kenedy); "Distributive Justice," and "A Living Wage," by John A. Ryan (Macmillan); "The Pope and the People" (Social Encyclical) (Catholic Truth Society); "Handbook of Practical Economics," by J. Schrijvers (Herder); "Catholic Studies in Social Reform" (A series of seven short manuals) (Herder); "Catholic Social Guild Series" (Two Vols.) (Herder); "The Social Value of the Gospel," by Leon Garriguet (Herder); "Private Ownership," by John C. Kelleher (Benziger); "Christian Social Reform" (Program of Bishop Ketteler), by George Metlak (Dolphin Press); "Consumers and Wage-Earners," by John Elliot Ross (Devin-Adair); "The Catholic's Work in the World," by Joseph Husslein, S.J. (Benziger); "The Church and Labor," by L. McKenna (Herder); "A Primer of Peace and War. Handbook of International Morality," by Charles D. Plater, S.J. (Kenedy); "Socialism: The Nation of Fatherless Children," by David Goldstein (Flynn); "Ideals of Charity," by Mrs. Virginia Crawford (Herder); "Catholic Ideals in Social Life," by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. (Benziger); "Political Economy," by Edmund J. Burke, S.J. (American Book); "The Characteristics and Religion of Modern Socialism," by John J. Ming, S.J. (Benziger); "The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII" (Benziger); "Marriage and Parenthood; the Catholic Ideal," by Thomas J. Gerrard (Wagner); "Primer of Social Science," by Mgr. Henry Parkinson (Devin-Adair); "Frederic Ozanam," by Kathleen O'Meara (Catholic School Book Co.); "Political and Moral Essays," by Joseph Rickaby, S.J. (Benziger); "St. Antonino, Patron of Economists," by Bede Jarrett, O.P. (Herder); "Socialism: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Application," by Victor Cathrein, S.J., and V. F. Gettelmann, S.J. (Herder); "History of St. Vincent de Paul," by Mgr. Bougaud, Bishop of Laval (Longmans); "The Fundamental Fallacy of Socialism" (Single Tax), by Arthur Preuss (Herder); "An Introduction to Economics," by Frank O'Hara (Macmillan).

The *Catholic Mind* occasionally publishes important papers and addresses bearing on modern social problems.

The following sonnet, entitled "The Peacemaker," was the last poem Sergeant Joyce Kilmer wrote:

Upon his will he binds a radiant chain.
For Freedom's sake he is no longer free.
It is his task, the slave of Liberty,
With his own blood to wipe away a stain.
That pain may cease he yields his flesh to pain.
To banish war he must a warrior be.
He dwells in night eternal dawn to see.
And gladly dies abundant life to gain.

What matters death, if Freedom be not dead?
No flags are fair, if Freedom's flag be furled.
Who fights for Freedom goes with joyful tread
To meet the fires of hell against him hurled,
And has for Captain, Him whose thorn-wreathed head
Smiles from the Cross upon a conquered world.

Mr. Edward Lucas White, whose notable historical novel, "El Supremo," has held the interest of many readers, seems to be quite as skilful as a short-story writer. For the ten tales in "The Song of the Sirens and Other Stories" (Dutton, \$1.90), which deal mainly with the life of ancient Greece and Rome and medieval Italy, are rich in classical erudition, are vigorously written, and are brought in almost every instance to a very effective climax. The first of the stories is an eye-witness's account of how the songs of Homer's Sirens are still luring hapless mariners to their death. Mr. White's description of what that deaf English nobleman saw is masterly. In "Iabas" we learn what Dido's sister Anna thought of Æneas, "Didona" tells how the kind gods gave Thessa the suitor of her choice, "The Elephant's Ear" describes how Hannibal's most effective arm was enticed across a river, "The Swimmers" is a story giving Commodore Bassus's own account of the way the wily Ripustians defeated him in battle, then follows the story of Balbinus's conquest of "The Skewbald Panther," and the two medieval tales that end the volume are sufficiently blood-curdling.

Besides being interesting, these stories of Mr. White are gratifyingly free from indelicacy and suggestiveness, and that is high praise nowadays.

BOOKS REVIEWED

- Benziger Brothers, New York:**
The Elstones. A Novel. By Isabel C. Clarke. \$1.35.
- Boni & Livwright, New York:**
Daisy Miller. An International Episode. By Henry James; Fairy Tales and Poems in Prose. By Oscar Wilde. \$0.70 each.
- The Devin-Adair Company, New York:**
A Hidden Phase of American History. Ireland's Part in America's Struggle for Liberty. By Michael J. O'Brien, Historiographer, American Irish Historical Society. Illustrated. \$5.00; Spiritualism and Religion "Can You Talk to the Dead?" Including a Study of the Most Remarkable Cases of Spirit Control. By Baron Johan Liljencrants, A.M.S.T.D. \$3.00.
- The Donnelly Press, New York:**
Labor in Irish History. By James Connolly. \$1.00.
- Doubleday, Page & Co., New York:**
The Valley of Vision. By Sarah Comstock; Ma Pettengill. By Harry Leon Wilson; Nomads of the North. By James Oliver Curwood. \$1.50 each; The American's Creed and Its Meaning. By Matthew Page Andrews. \$0.75; The British Navy in Battle. By Arthur H. Pollen. Illustrated. \$2.50.
- E. P. Dutton & Co., New York:**
En Route. By J. K. Huysmans. Translated from the French with a Prefatory Note by C. Kegan Paul. Fourth Edition. \$2.50.
- Harding & More, Ltd., 119 High Holborn, London:**
Some Fruits of Theosophy. The Origins and Purpose of the So-Called Old Catholic Church Disclosed by Stanley Morison. With a Preface by Herbert Thurston, S.J. 2s.
- Harper & Brothers, New York:**
What We Eat and What Happens to It. By Philip B. Hawk, Ph.D. \$1.35; Busy, the Life of an Ant. By Walter Flavius McCaleb. Illustrated. \$0.70.
- Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston:**
Running Eagle, the Warrior Girl. By James Willard Schultz. \$1.35; Ivan Speaks. Translated from the Russian by Thomas Whittemore. \$0.75; Dawn. By Eleanor H. Porter. With Illustrations by Lucius Wolcott Hitchcock. \$1.50; Dormitory Days. More Stories of St. Timothy's. By Arthur Stanwood Pier. With Illustrations. \$1.50.
- B. W. Huebsch, New York:**
The British Revolution and the American Democracy. An Interpretation of British Labor Programs. By Norman Angell. \$1.50; The Covenant of Peace, an Essay on the League of Nations. By H. N. Brailsford. \$0.25.
- Illinois Centennial Commission, Springfield:**
The Centennial History of Illinois. Volume Two. The Frontier State. 1818-1848. By Theodore Calvin Peace, University of Illinois.
- Imprimerie à l'Action Sociale Catholique, Montreal:**
Le Droit Paroissial de la Province de Quebec. Par Jean-François Pouliot, Avocat. \$8.00.
- Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale, Limitie, Quebec:**
La Déportation des Acadiens. Par Henri D'Arles.
- Imprimerie P. Dumont, Limoges:**
Bonds Binding to France the United States of North America. By F. Romanet du Caillaud. \$0.10.
- The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia:**
Jewish Contributions to Civilization. An Estimate. By Joseph Jacobs.
- A. M. Josienski, Halifax, N. S.:**
Reborn Poland. By A. M. Josienski.
- Alfred A. Knopf, New York:**
The Cabin (La Barraca). By Vicente Blasco Ibanez. Translated from the Spanish by Francis Haffkine Snow and Beatrice M. Mekota. With an Introduction by John Garrett Underhill. \$1.75.
- J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia:**
The Diamond Pin. By Carolyn Wells. \$1.35.
- Longmans, Green & Co., New York:**
Submarine and Anti-Submarine. By Henry Newbolt. Illustrated. \$2.25; Madam Constantia. The Romance of a Prisoner of War in the Revolution (South Carolina). Edited by Jefferson Carter. \$1.50.
- Oxford University Press, New York:**
Things New and Old. By John Swinnerton Phillimore. \$2.50; Some Aspects of the Victorian Age. By the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith. \$0.90.
- Frederick Pustet Co., Inc., New York:**
Compendium Theologiae Moralis. Editio Vicesima Septima. Ad Novum Codicem Juris Canonici Concinnata. A. Timotheo Barrett, S.J. \$4.50.
- Charles Scribner's Sons, New York:**
Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. Volume X, Picts—Sacraments. \$7.00; Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. Edited by James Hastings, D.D. Volume II. Macedonia—Zion. With Indexes. \$6.00; Altruism, Its Nature and Varieties. The Ely Lectures for 1917-18. By George Herbert Palmer. \$1.25.
- Small, Maynard & Co., Boston:**
The Fighting Shepherds. By Caroline Lockhart. \$1.50.
- Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York:**
Clemenceau, the Man and His Time. By H. M. Hyndman. \$2.00; Yashka: My Life as Peasant, Officer and Exile. By Maria Botchkareva, Commander of the Russian Women's Battalion of Death, as Set Down by Isaac Don Levine. \$2.00.
- The Stratford Co., Boston:**
Double-Eagles. By Mark S. Gross, S.J. \$1.50; The Making of the Church of England (A. D. 597-1087). A Course of Historical Lectures. By Thomas Allen Tidball, D.D. \$2.00.
- Yale University Press, New Haven:**
World-Power and Evolution. By Ellsworth Huntington, Ph.D. \$2.50; War Aims and Peace Ideas: Selections in Prose and Verse Illustrating the Aspirations of the Modern World. Edited by Tucker Brooke, B. Litt., and Henry Seidel Canby, Ph.D. \$1.80; The Chronicles of America Series. Allen Johnson, Editor. Vol. 2: The Spanish Conquerors. By Irving Berdine Richman; Vol. 6: The Fathers of New England. By Charles M. Andrews; Vol. 7: Dutch and English on the Hudson. By Maud Wilder Goodwin; Vol. 19: The Old Northwest. By Frederic Austin Ogg; Vol. 27: The Cotton Kingdom. By William E. Dodd; Vol. 28: The Anti-Slavery Crusade. By Jesse Macy; Vol. 30: The Days of the Confederacy. By Nathaniel W. Stephenson; Vol. 36: The Old Merchant Marine. By Ralph D. Paine; Vol. 39: The Age of Big Business. By Burton J. Hendrick; Vol. 40: The Boss and the Machine. By Samuel P. Orth. \$3.50 each.

EDUCATION

The Dramatic Impulse in Education

IN a little book entitled "The Kingdom of the Child," Mrs. Alice Henniger has presented a thesis on the value of the dramatic instinct as an educational force. The kingdom of the child is the world of make-believe, to which every child is naturally heir. Mrs. Henniger has given a striking example of the working of this principle in the elementary grades. In the chapter, "Learning to Read," she illustrates how a lethargic class of children, nodding over a monotonous lesson of the "see-the-cat" type, was galvanized into sparkling-eyed interest by the simple expedient of "let's suppose the cat is your cat at home and the baby mentioned is your new and interesting little brother."

No one can read this chapter and doubt the utility of the principle in the work of the first grade. But it may be objected that its extension to the college classroom is not possible. Certainly there is much apparent ground for the objection. Yet, on closer attention it will become clear, we think, that the principle may be given a much wider application, and that what is possible with the first grade is also possible with Browning or Shelley. I have known a professor of classical literature to act an oration against Catiline, take Demosthenes' part against Aeschines, or become Cicero, for the time being, in the marvelous exordium of the *Pro Archia*; become the great orator so completely, that gradually the class ceased to follow from afar. The spirit caught them too, the classroom faded to the Forum, the page of text became the living voice of Cicero embodying his thoughts, emotions and purposes. And when the lesson was over the student had *lived* what else had been a dull monotony of "qualities of exordium" and "elements of style."

THE EXTENSION OF THE PRINCIPLE

NOW though the appeal to the dramatic impulse may be made in the class of literature no less than in the class of reading, there is required of course on the part of the teacher a much greater effort. To say that the principle can be applied equally well, in both cases, is not to say that it can be applied with equal ease.

In the first case the application is comparatively simple: "Have you a cat at home?" starts the process; the appeal is to a concrete every-day experience, the association is swift and sure. But to teach Browning is to attempt to awaken appreciation for an experience far more complex and intangible, but of course of far more cultural value. And if appreciation is, as Dr. Woodbury tells us, power of sympathy with the esthetic experience depicted by the writer, is it wonderful that, with so much of the intangible, both in subject-matter and in purpose, those who could concede the utility of the principle of dramatization in the first grade might be skeptical as to its practicability in the higher forms?

Nevertheless, it would seem that this very nebulousness, this very subtlety of subject, with which the college teacher has to deal, renders necessary rather than impracticable, the principle of education we are discussing. For fundamentally, what the teacher of literature has to do is precisely what proved of such value in the first grade: to associate what is depicted with the life of the student. The difference is in what is depicted. In the one case it is a material object; in the other it is a mood, an aesthetic experience, elusive of explanation and cold analysis, to be caught, if at all, only in the fervor of genuine sympathy. We may talk about the cat, and even the weakest imagination can compass him; but to take the "unbodied joy" of Shelley or an emotional experience such as the "West Wind" and attempt to communicate it by talking about it, is to invite disaster. To talk it, better, to recreate it, is perhaps, to take the only sure road to success. The very abstraction of the subject matter, the dearth of words in all languages to describe such things, makes recreation (as far as possible) of the atmosphere, a necessity.

THE PROCESS OF RECREATION

BUT how recreate? Not certainly by affecting a "fine frenzy." I have known teachers, by this process, to endanger anything but a literary atmosphere. Not certainly by dissecting a work of literature as we might a syllogism; this is to number the bones in a skeleton, not to see, the soft bloom of health and beauty and life. There is only one way: time, place, persons, must, as far as possible, be forgotten; only the souls of the class and the artist must remain. Teacher and class must, so to speak, muse with Browning, or walk with Shelley in the woods; they must catch with him the first note of the West Wind, rise with it and let it "bear them as a leaf, a cloud." "Be thou me," must be their attitude in appreciation, as it was Shelley's in creation. They and not Alastor, alone, must wander through mystical glades and mountains and rivers and finally pine disconsolate and forlorn. If Keats flies to the nightingale, how can the class that would appreciate him remain below leaden-eyed among the "glooms"? And if at the teacher's cunning touch they do rise with the poet, what else will the experience have been but a dramatization, an enlistment of the faculty of make-believe; what else, but a kind of glorified "let's suppose," differing not in kind, but only in degree, from the method used in the reading class to gain entrance to "the kingdom of the child"?

CLEAR LIMITATIONS

YET it is clear that not all forms of higher education will admit of the appeal to the dramatic instinct. To understand the atomic theory we need not become, even imaginatively, atoms; nor must we, in the effort to grasp the binomial theorem, live the experience of a couple of quantities. To use this method in connection with such phases of college work is to take the high-road to failure. Nay, more, there are moments, even in the class of literature, when the exaltation I have mentioned is out of place; moments when the emotional and imaginative man are best excluded; when, namely not a great classic but the principles which in the course of generations have been deduced from him and his fellows, are to be, not illustrated, but explained. You cannot give precepts in the tone in which you would render "Spartacus to the Gladiators," nor can you discourse on the philosophy of art in the mental attitude of "Kubla Khan."

Where then shall we draw the line in the use of the dramatic impulse as a method of education? Perhaps the reply is, "where science ends and fine art begins." For science is dealing with fact, art, as Pater says, with sense of fact. Science is a matter of the intellectual man, art of the whole man, the composite, body as well as soul. A thought may be communicated directly, an experience, only indirectly; the one can be understood; the other must be felt; or (if this be too corporeal a word) it must be perceived. The analyst explains the emotion of "The Skylark," Shelley communicates it.

With this single limitation then it would seem that the whole of higher education will admit the use of the dramatic impulse as a means of teaching. The power to re-enact a scene or to recreate an esthetic experience, for educational purposes, is co-terminus with the realm, not of fact, but of fact which has been personalized.

The "dramatic impulse in education" is not new, nor has it, as Mrs. Henniger seems to imply, fallen into universal disuse. Wherever a Jesuit college has flourished this principle has been held in reverence; the cultivation of the dramatic impulse has not been confined to the production of a yearly play; the traditional ideal for the Jesuit teacher has ever been to re-enact, to recreate, the artistic experience under attention. Teachers, rather than lecturers, have been the ideal; and teachers always dramatize. It was so with the greatest of the pagans, Socrates; it was so with Him who came to teach the world. And if "the

kingdom of the child" should accomplish nothing but a re-introduction of this time-worn and time-honored principle to modern educators, surely the book will have amply repaid the long experience and the obvious care and effort which have gone towards its preparation.

GEORGE D. BULL, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

Is the Eighteenth Amendment Constitutional?

SO much has been written on the constitutionality of the Eighteenth Amendment, that the average lay mind is in a state of absolute confusion. This is not surprising. Most Americans are light readers. For the vast majority the press is their daily arbiter on all questions. Our people seem to forget that "consistency is a jewel" not possessed by the press. In fact, consistency would be of little use, because the business of the press is to be sensational, to give news without an eye to truth alone, and to protect the particular interest or groups which it represents. This applies particularly to the metropolitan press; yet it must satisfy the public, else there would be no sale for it.

WHAT IS A TWO-THIRDS VOTE?

WE will treat separately the objections raised against the constitutionality of the Amendment.

Objection 1. The resolution proposing the Amendment was not passed by a two-thirds vote of all the Senators and Congressmen elected.

Article 5 of the Constitution states very specifically how it shall be amended. Amendments may be proposed to the legislatures of the States for ratification on a resolution passed by two-thirds of *both* houses of Congress; or, on application from two-thirds of the States, Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments, but the proposed amendment before becoming part of the Constitution must be ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof. Congress has always resorted to the first method. It has never received a request to call a convention for proposing amendments from two-thirds of the States.

Article 1, Section 5, of the Constitution says: "A majority of each [house] shall constitute a quorum to do business." When Congress passed the resolution proposing this Amendment, it was necessary to have a quorum only present. A decision given by the United States Supreme Court against the Missouri Pacific R. R., which violated the Webb-Kenyon bill, upholds this. The railroad charged that the Webb-Kenyon bill, which Congress passed over the President's veto had not been enacted in conformity with the Constitution as laid down in Section 7 of Article 1. The railroad held, that to override the President's veto, it required a two-thirds vote of all the Senators and Congressmen elected. The Court ruled adversely on this point, holding that a two-thirds vote, in each house of the members present, there being a quorum, is all that is required. The opinion was given by Chief Justice White, and carries this very significant paragraph:

The identity between the provision of Article 5 of the Constitution, giving the power by a two-thirds vote to submit amendments, and the requirements we are considering as to the two-thirds vote necessary to override a veto, makes the practice as to the one applicable to the other.

The opinion given by the Chief Justice settles the first objection. A two-thirds vote of both houses, provided there is a quorum present, is sufficient to submit proposed amendments to the Constitution.

The Sixty-fifth Congress on joint resolution by the required two-thirds vote, proposed to the legislatures of the States the following amendment:

Article 18. Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Objection 2. The Amendment was promulgated before it had been ratified by all the States. Its provisions will not apply to those States which failed to ratify, or which rejected it. This is a common objection.

MUST ALL THE STATES RATIFY?

IT required three-fourths or thirty-six States to ratify the Amendment. The legislatures of some forty odd States took favorable action on it, and it will therefore be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution. The Constitution is the supreme law of the United States, and the provisions of the Eighteenth Amendment apply equally to every State in the Union. The States came into the Union of their own volition, and as such bound themselves to the conditions of the Constitution. Once in the Union no State can secede. That was definitely settled at Appomattox when Lee tendered his sword to Grant. No State can nullify any part of the Constitution.

Objection 3. The legislatures of Ohio and California ratified the Amendment whereas it should have been submitted in these States to a referendum.

The Constitution requires that amendments be ratified by the legislatures of the States, not by the people. No State can make a law to the contrary. The Constitution is supreme, and amendments must be made in conformity with the provisions laid down therein. When New Mexico and Arizona applied for admission to the Union, Congress required as a condition of admission, that New Mexico change its proposed constitution so that in proposing amendments to the Constitution, or ratifying amendments proposed thereto, a majority vote in each branch of its legislature would suffice. New Mexico by complying with the request of Congress accepted every condition laid down in the Constitution, and was thereby admitted into the Union.

The right of a State to withdraw its vote after ratification of an amendment has been given, has never been recognized; but, on the other hand, a State that has rejected an amendment can reconsider its action before the amendment becomes part of the Constitution.

PERSONAL LIBERTY

THAT the amendment invades the province of personal liberty and is therefore unconstitutional, is another serious objection.

Who is to declare the Amendment unconstitutional? It does not come within the province of the Supreme Court to do so. Briefly stated the duty of the Supreme Court "is to see that the laws are made in accordance with the Constitution." Any statute enacted by Congress or the States, which contravenes the provisions of the Constitution will be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court when brought before it for decision. The Supreme Court derives its power from Article 3 of the Constitution.

Perhaps it is not generally known that all privileges and immunities retained by the people under the Constitution can be amended away. The Constitution places no restriction upon the number or nature of the amendments which may be made thereto,

except that no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Section 3 of the amendment leads the writer to believe that the Supreme Court *might* declare the Amendment unconstitutional because it has not been drawn in accordance with the provisions laid down in Article 5 of the Constitution. Congress had no authority to place a limitation as to the time within which the States should ratify the Amendment. When Congress stipulated that the Amendment would become inoperative unless ratified by the legislatures of the States within seven years, Congress usurped a power not conferred upon it by the Constitution, and under the circumstances, the Court might set the Amendment aside on the ground that it was not drawn in accordance with the requirements of Article 5. On the other hand, the Court may hold, as the Amendment was ratified before the time set by Congress expired, there was no ground for action. But had it not been ratified within the time prescribed there would be ground for action. It is very difficult to prophesy what the Court will do in such cases. Very often the unexpected happens. All anti-liquor legislation has been studiously upheld by the Supreme Court.

WHAT IS INTOXICATING LIQUOR?

WE may expect very many legal disputes under this Amendment. The first of these will probably be "What is intoxicating liquor?" Will every drink containing alcohol be held intoxicating? If not, what is to be the dividing line? Will liquors containing two per cent or five per cent or thirty per cent be considered intoxicating? Suppose it is agreed that liquor containing ten per cent alcohol is not intoxicating, and should it ferment a fraction over this, who is to detect it? Will there be a staff of inspectors and testers to examine every household?

A law so drastic in its nature as to strike at the liberty of the people by regulating their personal habits, will cause continual turmoil and conflict and disrespect for the law. It is very likely to lead to serious trouble because prohibition of the use of alcoholic liquor interferes with a custom which is as old as the human race and characteristic of every civilized nation. Congress might therefore permit the manufacturing of beers and wines not containing over eight or ten per cent alcohol, and the Supreme Court might decide such beverages to be non-intoxicating liquors.

Under the Amendment Congress has power to enforce its provisions through legislation. Now that the people have permitted an active and organized minority to write an amendment into the Constitution, which makes it no longer regarded as a sacred bond protecting the liberty, and freedom of all, it remains for those who believe in personal liberty to elect a Congress which will make the Eighteenth Amendment as dead as the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. Against the enforcement of Prohibition there is a very strong body of sound-thinking citizens who will henceforth make their will felt at the ballot-box. It will have a powerful influence on Congress in defining what is intoxicating liquor, and how the provisions of the Amendment is to be enforced. Further, the acts of one Congress can be undone by another.

In order to make Prohibition ineffective from the beginning, all efforts must now be concentrated on Congress, because State legislation cannot in cases of this nature take precedence over Congressional legislation. Of course Congress and the States have concurrent power to enforce the Amendment, in view of which Congress may leave the enforcement entirely to the States. If so, some States will endeavor to enforce the law as enacted by Congress, while other States will not. The strength of all law lies in the force of public opinion behind it. Public opinion in the Eastern States and in the large cities is decidedly against Prohibition. The South favors Prohibition in theory.

JOHN MCGUINNESS.

NOTE AND COMMENT

No Prohibition Jubilee

NEVER once during all the sessions of the recent New Jersey Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church was the National Prohibition Amendment made a subject of jubilation. Not even was a resolution passed to prevent the rejection of Prohibition by New Jersey. The reason for ignoring entirely the Methodist Prohibition jubilee was due, according to the *New York Times*, to Edward J. Handley, Clerk of the House of Assembly:

Handley began a careful study of Prohibition as it existed in Ocean Grove, Asbury Park, Bradley Beach, Avon, and other Monmouth County cities within a mile limit of Bradley, the camp meeting town. As a result of his survey Handley asserted that eighty-seven per cent of the crime committed in Monmouth County occurred in the area where Prohibition has been in force for upward of forty years, and that seven out of every ten murders that have occurred in the county have taken place within the district where Prohibition holds.

This was hardly a record to give any cause for rejoicing even over a Methodist Prohibition victory.

Church Unity

ACCORDING to the *New York World* of March 27 progress towards religious unity is such that men of good-will are now looking forward to the complete success of their plans. Just how the doctrinal and disciplinary differences of the sects are to be removed is not clear, but apparently neither doctrine nor discipline is to be allowed to thwart the purpose of union. For according to a prominent Protestant Episcopal member of the commission:

The Episcopal Church has proposed to the Congregational Church that any minister of the Congregational denomination may be ordained by Episcopalians. A conference of Congregational and Episcopal clergy agreed to submit the proposal to the various congregations.

There you have it. Doctrine is to be thrown to the winds and men will ultimately unite on the common ground of infidelity in order to promote the Kingdom of the Christ on earth. What the members of the "High Church" will say is open to conjecture. Perhaps they will begin to hold that the Congregational Church is also a branch of the Catholic Church, a quandary to be sure.

A Methodist Union of Church and State

THE following is the greater part of an editorial which recently appeared in the *Miami Herald* under the heading "More Campaigns Against Liberty":

When the Church and State are mentioned the average American mind imagines that reference is made solely to the alleged attempts of the Roman Catholic Church to attain political ascendancy in this country, and the average man is blind to the attempts of any other religious organization to obtain control of government and people.

For many months the *Herald* has been watching with considerable curiosity the course of an organization calling itself the Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals of the Methodist Church, North. This paper is in receipt of its published literature and has studied its methods, as far as possible. The aim and purpose of the board is pretty well illustrated in an interview with its secretary, Rev. Clarence True Wilson, in a telegraphic dispatch from Washington to a New York paper of very recent date.

"Politically the board," [so says its reverend secretary], "will never consent to the nomination, or if nominated, the election of any man for President of the United States who opposes Prohibition or would be lukewarm on its enforcement. It will follow this line down to the governors, sheriffs, district attorneys and others." It will be well to remember that this board is the official spokesman of a great

religious organization and that the board intends to commit the organization it represents to a certain political program, to secure the election of officials satisfactory to it and to defeat all those who will not obey its behests. That is a pretty fair intimation that there is to be a union of Church and State in this country. Imagine the awful howl that would go up if a Roman Catholic committee of any kind should make the same statement.

But this particular board proposes to go farther, according to its secretary. The program of the board [he says] "is going much farther in its efforts to correct the morals and habits of the people of the nation." It is going to begin a campaign against the cigarette. It is going to demand that the Bible be put back in the public schools, everywhere. An anti-gambling crusade is to be waged. It is hinted that dancing is to be prohibited. Prize fighting is to be fought. The continental Sunday is to be opposed, and "we should see to it that we get our American foundation as it was before the Hun trampled it out in most of the American cities," which means that the Puritan Sabbath is to be enforced all over the country.

We are to presume that as this same board claims a very large part of the credit for the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment, it is going to enforce its program by other constitutional amendments secured in the same way it secured the Eighteenth. The reverend gentleman has put the country on notice that it is to be ruled by his particular church organization just as soon as it secures the necessary power, and the pity of it is that the American people will not wake up to the invasion on their liberties until it is everlastingly too late.

The campaign against tobacco is well under way. Others are apparently to follow in turn.

There Spoke the Common Man

THE war is over and there is no reason for continuing the bitterness of the past. This is the sentiment of our soldiers and even of the British troops in Germany and it is the sentiment of the people at home. Some interesting illustrations of this fact are given by Marion Reedy, who writes in the *Mirror*:

General Plummer said in effect that the British soldiers in Germany would revolt if they were much longer compelled to witness the starvation of German women and children, and therefore he recommended the lifting of the blockade. There spoke the common man, God bless him. And so speaks the United States soldier in Germany. So spoke our "doughboys" in those misunderstood articles of Mr. Ralph Pulitzer in the *Post-Dispatch*. Our fighters do not want to starve the German people. They are content to have "canned the Kaiser." If the British and United States combat troops in Germany feel that, having fought the German armies, they yet like the German people, we may be sure that the masses of men from whom those combat troops were drawn feel that the thing desired is peace and not more war. Those combat troops represent the peoples who stand menacingly over the Peace Conference saying the peace must be a fair one and must not contain the germs of more war. An officer of our army just back from Germany told me on Tuesday that our boys are for the German people, that they believe that too drastic terms will drive Germans wholly into Bolshevism and that protraction of the war will spread Bolshevism in the British, French and American armies too.

There can be no doubting the truth and wisdom of these words. The ancient imperialism of statesmen who set annexation before world peace and international stability and would not hesitate to create new and lasting causes of discord cannot be seconded by men who fought to make the world safe for democracy

The Prussian Machinations at Washington

THE attempt to Prussianize our American schools will meet with public opposition in proportion as men realize the nature of the proposed enactments of obsolete Teutonic statecraft, that shrewd politicians and powerful lobbyists would im-

pose upon the nation by such measures as the Smith bill. On this subject the Cincinnati *Enquirer* recently said on its editorial page:

Under the guise of nationalizing the public-school system of the United States efforts are being made to introduce through a congressional enactment precisely the system that the Prussian autocrats utilized a half century ago. It is proposed to direct curricula and training of teachers from the banks of the Potomac and to place in the President's Cabinet a Secretary of Public Education. There are professed to financially weak States and districts subventions from the public treasury.

An end, and a sudden end, should be put to these machinations. It is a cardinal principle that control of education should be kept close to the people. Vast, indeed, was the concession of the family to the State when authority over the teaching of the child was surrendered in part. As a compensation the voters were clothed with power to choose the educators and supervise the curriculum, and they have guarded it with commendable jealousy.

To forego this privilege of controlling the throttle and to relinquish it to Federal officials miles away and under political influence is unthinkable. If the proponents of this plan desire only to assist the poverty-stricken schools, as they profess, this can be done without adding to the relief legislation the dangerous right of declaring how the money shall be spent and for what ends. Federalization of education is a serpent that ought first to be scathed and then slain.

The methods that we are urged to adopt were already arousing well-founded dissatisfaction and anxiety in Germany years before they contributed so materially towards the universal disaster of the world war.

In the Matter of Woman's Dress

THE International Federation of Catholic Alumnae in its *Bulletin* recently called attention to the matter of dress. The fighting lad is discarding his uniform and woman likewise is changing the distinguishing dress she had adopted. But now:

The low neck, or rather the high girdle, is again coming into vogue, much to the amazement and the disgust of thinking people. Where are the prophets of the early war days who saw a new world opening to woman? Are the boys we sent over to fight for womanhood to return to find that their own women were not worth the sacrifice? Won't some of them wonder why in our prodigality in dressing the poor Belgians we did not do the same for ourselves? Does it not seem that the brave carriage, the uprightness of body and soul of these our lads will be endangered by the luxury, the voluptuousness, the paganism of their women?

It is good that our educated Catholic women have taken this stand. They are but reiterating a protest uttered by them long before the secular press itself was forced to point out the disgraceful conditions existing in this regard, or the City Federation of Women's Clubs in New York publicly blamed designers of women's evening gowns for having led fashion "to the extreme limit of indecency" and brought about "a most demoralizing effect upon the youth of the country." As the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle* remarked at that time, it is folly to blame designers when the women of New York have matters wholly in their own hand. "Don't appeal to designers. Don't appeal publicly to women. Just snub relentlessly every immodestly dressed woman and in a short time no one will appear to be snubbed." That, the editor remarks, has always been the well-bred woman's way of regulating social matters that need regulation. Catholics will best know how to combine charity and strength in suppressing this evil. The International Federation of Catholic Alumnae has on every occasion sought to make of all its members the true salt of society. They are the leaven wherewith society will be raised to a higher conception of the purity and dignity of womanhood. "If, as we Catholics believe," says their *Bulletin*, "our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, let us at least veil them, as the Jews of old veiled from profane gaze their Holy of Holies."

